DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 159 PS 010 827

TITLE	Together is Best: Families and Schools. Findings of the Parent Education Demonstration Project in Region IV.
INSTITUTION	Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Atlanta, Ga.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Aug 76
CONTRACT	304-75-6001
NOTE	108p.; Photographs may not reproduce clearly
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Child Development; *Demonstration Programs; Early Childhood Education; *Educational Improvement; Educational Programs; Home Visits; Libraries; Mobile Educational Services; *Parent Education; *Parent Influence; Parent School Relationship; Parent Workshops; *Preschool Children; Program Evaluation; Staff Improvement; Toys

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this first year report of the Region IV Parent Education Demonstration Project (PEDP) is to help other school systems as they plan and conduct parent/child programs. The Region IV PEDP involved 29 local school systems which were conducting 31 parent education programs through various funding sources. These parent programs had as one objective the enhancement of parents' influence on the cognitive, affective, social, and motor development of their children, particularly preschool children. The regional project encouraged and assisted the school systems in implementing the new role involved in their programs; provided any necessary technical assistance in staff development, materials selection and development, and program management; and began the process of assessing and describing the methodologies and activities of the various programs with the intent of highlighting the most effective and replicable elements. Contents of the report include discussions of parent education; the Region IV PEDP's structure, activities and evaluation process; and local program components such as parent workshops, home visitation, and toy and material libraries. An overview of each participating program is included. Participating LEA addresses and key personnel are listed. (Author/RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178159

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Together Is Best

Families and Schools

Findings of the
Parent Education Demonstration Project
in Region IV

Education Improvement Program
Southern Association
of Colleges and Schools

August 1976

PS 010827

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS
795 Peachtree Street NW, Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Felix C. Robb, Director
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

Edsel T. Godbey, Director
Education Improvement Program

Shelby L. Johnson, Associate Director
Parent Education Demonstration Project

Carolyn Vandiviere, Secretary
Parent Education Demonstration Project

Edward T. Brown, Consultant
Parent Education Demonstration Project

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, REGION IV
Room 555
50 Seventh Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Cecil L. Yarbrough
Commissioner of Education, Region IV

Polly B. McIntosh
Assistant Regional Commissioner and Project Officer for Parent Education Demonstration Project

Fran J. Conway
Program Assistant

John H. Finley
Administrative Assistant

This publication was prepared pursuant to Contract 304-75-6001, awarded to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools by the Office of Education, Region IV. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position nor the policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

Preface

All too rarely does there come to an organization the opportunity to engage in activity that is clearly in the vanguard of progress. The Parent Education Demonstration Project (PEDP) is such.

In May, 1975, the U.S. Office of Education (USOE), Region IV, asked the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) to assume an evaluative and collaborative role in an eight-state, twenty-nine school system joint project in parent and early childhood education. We were not only willing but glad to be a partner in this important effort with USOE, local school systems, and parents of young children. SACS made available, via a contract, the professional and administrative resources of its Education Improvement Program (EIP). With remarkable swiftness EIP was able to obtain a competent staff required to coordinate the evaluation and technical assistance services.

With schools undergoing uncommon stress, emphasis upon improving the education of very young children *and their parents* makes good sense. Local school systems did the basic job and did it well. They and the Office of Education are to be commended for perceiving the value of evaluating their efforts as a key factor in accountability.

I wish to express appreciation to former U.S. Commissioner Terrel H. Bell for the original concept and for his initial interest in funding a project to study the education of very young children and their parents. To staff members Edsel Godbey, Director of EIP, and to Cleon Arrington, Shelby Johnson, and Carolyn Vandiviere, the three PEDP staff members, are due special appreciation for a world of good work in carrying out their responsibilities.

Above all, appreciation is extended to Dr. Cecil Yarbrough, Commissioner of Education of Region IV, for his forceful leadership in bringing about the Parent Education Demonstration Project, seeing to its successful launch, and for caring about its outcomes and impact in the Southeastern region of the United States.

The work of the Parent Education Demonstration Project is well begun but unfinished. With another year of uninterrupted effort, substantial additional payoff would be obtained and the dissemination of useful ideas accomplished. The work should go forward in the continuous struggle to counteract the forces of ignorance that deny children and their parents their finest destiny.

Felix C. Robb
Director, Southern Association
of Colleges and Schools

August, 1976

The Parent and Staff Attitudinal Surveys which are referred to on page 13 of this report were developed and field tested by the Parent/Child Interaction Project under the direction of Dr. Earl Schaefer of the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Neither the Office of Education nor the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools were involved in the collection of the data. The data were not collected in the name of either of these agencies, nor was the collection of such data required by the statement of work. The data included in the report were collected, analyzed and reported by the staff of the Parent/Child Interaction and are included merely to give substance, strength and an additional dimension to a positive and successful regional effort.

A word of thanks to the program directors who responded to our request by graciously providing photographs for this publication. The following school systems have been graphically represented here: Montgomery Public Schools in Alabama; Alachua and Broward Counties in Florida; Chattanooga, Murfreesboro, and Nashville Metro School Systems in Tennessee. Our appreciation is also expressed to the unknown photographer who did the expressive cover photo sometime ago. It has been in our files for years, waiting for this moment, but to our regret its source has been lost.

Contents

Introduction	1
Parent Education	3
The Region IV Parent Education Demonstration Project	5
The Regional Project's Structure	7
Activities of the Regional Project	11
Evaluation Process	15
Services of Parent/Child Programs	17
Parent Workshops	21
Home Visiting	27
Toy and Material Libraries	31
Learning Programs for Preschoolers	35
Materials Developed by Parent/Child Programs	39
Staffing of Parent/Child Programs	41
Staff Development	43
Overview of Each Participating Program	47

Appendixes

A: Local Participating School Systems	89
B: Advisory Committee Members	95
C: Evaluators	97

Introduction

The regional Parent Education Demonstration Project involved 29 local school systems which were conducting 31 parent education programs through various funding sources. These parent programs had as one objective that of enhancing parents' influence on the cognitive, affective, social, and motor development of their children, particularly preschool children. The regional project encouraged and assisted the school systems in implementing the new role involved in their programs; provided any necessary technical assistance in staff development, materials selection and development, and program management; and began the process of assessing and describing the methodologies and activities of the various programs with the intent of highlighting the most effective and replicable elements. It was hoped that a report of the experiences of this first year would help other school systems as they plan and conduct parent/child programs. Toward that end, this publication has been prepared.

Parent Education

Why the emphasis on parents?

Teacher observation and careful studies support the conclusion that a child's success in school is dependent on the readiness with which he or she enters the schooling process. This readiness in turn is related to the knowledge, skills, understandings, and experience of parents in child growth and development. The parents' involvement in their children's learning and development during the early years is crucial to social and school success later on.

Why should public schools get involved in parent and family programs?

Parents and parenting persons are important to the child's development and total educational program. A child has a hard time succeeding at school without first having succeeded at home. Public schools and early childhood programs are recognizing their own role in enhancing the parents' influence on the child's total development: social, intellectual, emotional, and motor. This relatively recent revival of awareness of the interdependency between families and schools opens another area of service for the public schools themselves —assisting parents in their roles as teachers and as the principal influences on their children's development and education.

Then, too, educators, especially those in special programs, whatever their sources of funding, are increasingly concerned with a child's (and a family's) transition from infant and preschool programs to the public school program at kindergarten or first grade. As a child benefits from the varied programs available from infancy (or even prenatal) through high school and beyond, one constant factor is ever present—parents or other caregivers. Staff and teachers change, programs change, locations change, but the influence and guidance of parents remain.

The constant link among the many educational programs which a child may experience is the parents and family. Total family involvement during the early years must be encouraged and cannot be abandoned as the child enters public school. Parents who have been encouraged and guided in becoming more involved in their children's development are not likely to become passive once the children enter school. The transition between family involvement in preschool years and school years needs to be complete. Public schools can be a major resource for family development and parent education as well as children's education.

What does this growing relationship between school and home involve?

For parents, seeing the schools as a resource for family development and themselves as the first and most important teachers of their children requires a change in accustomed attitudes. For the schools, the expansion of their role to assisting families—adults and children—in their total development as parents and persons also requires a change in philosophy, as well as a change in practices and procedures.

Translating this larger role into practice is often difficult for schools. The most common reason for this difficulty is that school personnel have had little or no experience in projecting themselves as educational resources for parents and as persons who can actually assist in the parenting process. Furthermore, in spite of competency in their own fields, public school personnel beginning a parent program often find themselves unfamiliar with the knowledges and techniques of adult education, child development, community program development, use of resources, and so on. In addition, school personnel are faced with the need for developing new and untried delivery patterns: family meetings at community centers or churches, parent workshops, home visits, and volunteer activities

in the school, to name a few. These problems, however, can be solved and should not stop a school system from building a successful parent/child program.

How can parent programs be funded?

All but one of the 31 programs that participated in the regional project this year were funded from federal sources. Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act funded 13 of the programs. Another 13 included a parent education component as part of their Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) programs. Four received funds from ESEA, Title I and/or Head Start, and one existed completely on local funds.

Other possibilities for funding include the recently implemented Title IV, Section (c) authorization of P.L. 93-380; the Right-To-Read Program; the training program of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped; Early Education of the Handicapped Program; and various other programs with some interest in parent education or parent involvement in children's learning, such as a state's adult education program, the Appalachian Regional Commission, and public library programs.

The most stable funding source, of course, is that of a local school board. Many parent programs find that, as they show success (and inform the decision makers of that success), local support for parent programs increases. A parent component may then become a permanent part of the local school system's budget. As a goal, parent programs should be working toward total local support.

The Region IV Parent Education Demonstration Project

How and when did the regional project begin?

Long before July 1975 when the parent Education Demonstration Project began, Dr. Cecil Yarbrough, Commissioner of Education in Region IV, appointed a Task Force on Early Childhood Education consisting of the Chief State School Officers of the eight states of Region IV. The Task Force, meeting several times, discussed the compelling factors for initiating a regional project and recognized the need for more information on existing parent-oriented early childhood programs. To gather such information, the Task Force, via the South Carolina Department of Education, contracted with the Institute for Development of Human Resources at the University of Florida. The Institute was to describe exemplary programs, to compile information in an easy-to-use format, and to assemble a list of related materials on parent-oriented early childhood education. The resulting report, *Parent Oriented Home-Based Early Childhood Education Programs: A Decision Oriented Review*, was published by the South Carolina Department of Education in May of 1975.

The Region IV Parent Education Demonstration Project emerged from the Task Force's work and the resulting publication and from the thinking of many educators in the region. It received the support of U.S. Commissioner of Education Terrel H. Bell and began actual operations in July 1975. Management of the project was contracted to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools through its Education Improvement Program.

What were the intents of the Region IV Parent Education Demonstration Project?

Most public school systems, while recognizing the benefits of family/school involvement, have much need for assistance in developing such a program. The regional project was established to assist local school systems in all phases of planning, conducting, and evaluating their parent/child programs.

As stated in its planning paper, the purposes of the regional project were:

1. To develop an organizational structure for the regional project which will provide for technical assistance, information flow, and evaluation.
2. To provide technical assistance to local education agencies in planning, implementation, operation, and evaluation of parent education projects for early childhood.
   a. To establish systems of internal evaluation based on continuous assessment of the individual project's operation and management processes and results.
   b. To provide information on techniques, materials, procedures which have been effective elsewhere.
   c. To assist in staff development as requested by local projects or as the need is perceived by project staff.
3. To develop a design for project evaluation that includes conducting external project audits (reviews) of each project to verify the results of internal evaluation, to assess the appropriateness of program operation and management, and to determine cost efficiency of various programs.
   a. To identify in the participating projects effective techniques of parent education that may be implemented by other local education agencies.
   b. To determine the nature and extent of staff development needed for successful implementation by local education agencies of parent education projects for early childhood.

Briefly, what were some of the accomplishments of the Parent Education Demonstration Project this first year?

Some of the highlights and accomplishments of the project were.

1. the sponsoring of three implementation workshops and one regional conference,
2. the completion of at least two on-site visits to each participating local school system,
3. the provision of consultant assistance to local projects that requested or that showed a need,
4. the distribution to participating projects of relevant information and materials relating to parent education,
5. the involvement of 25 professionals in an official advisory capacity through three Advisory Committee meetings and frequent mailings,
6. the support of parent activities planned or conducted by other agencies in the region,
7. the coordination with the Education Improvement Program of the external evaluation of local participating projects,
8. the coordination of the adoption and field test of attitude surveys for parents and for local program staff,
9. progress toward building additional competencies in State Departments of Education for planning and assisting parent education programs,
10. the development of cooperative efforts among various federal, regional, state, and local agencies regarding parent education programs conducted by local school systems. Specifically these agencies were the Southern Association, the Office of Education, the Office of Child Development, the State Departments of Education, the General Assistance Centers, the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, and other interested institutions.

The Regional Project's Structure

The first objective of the Parent Education Demonstration Project was to develop an organizational structure which would provide for technical assistance, information flow, and evaluation. The organizational structure was developed with the belief that as many educational and service agencies as possible should be included in order to avoid duplication of effort and to make the best use of existing resources. Building a regional network of agencies and individuals interested in developing parent/child programs in schools requires time to work out new relationships and roles. The progress made toward establishing a network during this first year was just a beginning.

How was the regional project managed?

The contract between the Regional Office of Education and the Southern Association called for a project director, an associate director, and a secretary to be housed at the Association as staff of the Education Improvement Program. These persons were accountable to the EIP Director and to a Project Officer in the Regional Office of Education. From time to time the project staff hired individuals to carry out specially assigned tasks such as helping to develop the evaluation plan, coordinating the regional conference, and visiting all participating programs the second time to gather specific information. A Ford Foundation Fellow and an administrative assistant on a cooperative program from Georgia State University also assisted in several project activities.

How did the 29 school systems become involved?

A review was made of the proposals for which funds were awarded to school systems for Title III and ESAA projects in Region IV. Those who had planned a parent education component were invited to participate in a consortium arrangement with the Southern Association. Certain exemplary Title I programs and one local program were called to the attention of project managers and these systems, too, were invited. A formal agreement was signed by 29 participating agencies, representing 31 programs with a parent component. A list of the 31 programs appears in Appendix A.

What were the responsibilities of the participating school systems to the regional project?

At the beginning of the year each participating system signed a consortium agreement with the Southern Association. At an initial orientation conference in July the roles of the school systems, or more specifically the parent/child programs, were discussed. Generally these roles were the following:

1. Each participating system will develop its own parent education program; objectives will be written in measureable terms; activities to meet objectives will be clearly defined; and an internal evaluation plan will be designed and implemented.
2. Each participating system will be responsible for conducting its parent program and internally evaluating the results.
3. Each system will agree to participate in an outside educational program audit that validates its internal evaluation.
4. Each system will make program progress reports as required.

The 31 participating parent programs carried out these responsibilities capably and willingly. In addition, they agreed to at least two on-site visits during the year from project staff or representatives. Much information was requested from the local programs throughout the year, often in the form of questionnaires, always requiring time in the busy schedules

of directors and staff. Nearly all project directors realized the importance of such information and responded immediately.

Did the regional project have an advisory group?

Yes, an Advisory Committee was appointed early in the year, consisting of 15 prominent individuals in the Southeast. Later, eight persons representing the eight state departments of education were added to this Committee, functioning as liaisons among their agencies, the regional project, and the Office of Education. The Advisory Committee met three times this year to review project plans and progress and to make suggestions for future activities and direction. A list of committee members appears in Appendix B.

The National Office of Education in Washington, D.C. also provided an intra-agency liaison group of professionals from the bureaus within the Office of Education to provide guidance and technical assistance to the Regional Office of Education and to the Parent Education Demonstration Project.

How was the Office of Education involved in project activities?

Throughout the year, the Office of Education assisted and advised the regional project and supported its activities. Office of Education personnel worked closely with PEDP staff in planning and conducting conferences, in visiting participating school systems, in securing guidance of professionals in the region through the project's Advisory Committee, and in gaining support for the concept of parent education and involvement through personal appearances and individual assistance.

Were any other federal agencies involved in the activities of the regional project?

The Director of the Region IV Office of Child Development and an OCD Parent Involvement Specialist are among the 15 original members of the project's Advisory Committee. The Office of Child Development through its Child Development Specialist assisted extensively in arranging a two-day training conference in February for over 50 school personnel. Presenters at the conference were representatives of three OCD training providers: Nova University, Clinch-Powell Educational Cooperative, and TARESA (Top of Alabama Regional Educational Service Agency). The Office of Child Development was also one of the four co-sponsors of a regional conference on parent education, with the theme "Families and Schools: Alliance for Learning." Nearly 500 educators from around the region participated in this conference May 6 and 7 in Fort Lauderdale. Other co-planners and sponsors were the Office of Education, the Parent Education Demonstration Project of the Education Improvement Program in the Southern Association, and the Broward County Schools. Such cooperative ventures have demonstrated well the advantages of agencies' working together toward mutual goals.

How did the state departments of education participate in the regional project?

One must remember that the original planning for the regional project came from a Task Force delegated by the Chief State School Officers in Region IV. Once the project was underway the CSSO's appointed one staff member from each of the eight states to act as liaison between the state departments and the regional project and between the regional project and the local school systems. These eight persons served on the project's Advisory Committee, furnished assistance to school systems, and from time to time assisted regional project staff with special tasks. These state department liaisons, as well as the other Advisory Committee members, were invited to all conferences sponsored by the

project. The intent was to begin to build a capacity within each state to institutionalize parent education projects or activities.

What about the General Assistance Centers?

The seven General Assistance Centers in Region IV were considered important in the project's communication network because of their unique and close relationships to nearly every school system in their service areas. Staff of the GAC's were invited to participate in regional conferences as resource persons, facilitators, and participants. Several of the region's GAC's were quite active this year in parent education/involvement activities within their own states, offering individual assistance to local program staff, conducting area conferences, and distributing awareness information on materials available to parent programs. The regional project was invited by the University of Tennessee GAC to cosponsor two Tennessee-Kentucky meetings, one at the beginning of the year, the other at year's end. The GAC invited to these meetings all of the projects in Tennessee and Kentucky that were participating in the regional project as well as the ESAA programs. Also, a year-end conference of the Carolina ESAA programs was organized by the GAC's in North and South Carolina and the Region IV Office of Education. The Associate Director of the PEDP spoke briefly at the conference and facilitated two small group sessions on parent education.

Did the regional project co-sponsor any other conferences?

In January a two-day parent education conference was held at Middle Tennessee State University and cooperatively sponsored by MTSU, the Parent Education Demonstration Project, the Murfreesboro City Schools, and the Tennessee Department of Education. Many of the 150 participants received credit for their work at this conference, which was conducted by the director of the "Classroom on Wheels" program in Murfreesboro.

What other cooperative ventures were there?

The Parent Education Demonstration Project was pleased to be involved in several conferences during the year sponsored and conducted by other agencies or organizations. One was a regional conference sponsored by the Office of Child Development and organized by the Chapel Hill Training-Outreach Project, held May 26-28 in Atlanta. Most participants of the conference were from Head Start programs in Region IV, especially those serving handicapped children. An exhibit representing the Parent Education Demonstration Project was displayed during the two days and offered visitors many kinds of "take home" information and materials.

Later in July the Associate Director of the PEDP organized and conducted two parent education discussion sessions at the Southwide Conference on Elementary Education sponsored by the Commission on Elementary Schools. Another presenter for these sessions was the director of Savannah's ESAA Early Bird Program for 50 preschoolers and their parents.

Also, the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center in Chapel Hill played an important role in activities of the regional project this year by helping to produce and field test a parent attitude survey and a staff attitude survey for use by parent/child programs. More details on this collaborative effort are described in the next section.

Activities of the Regional Project

The second objective of the Parent Education Demonstration Project was to provide technical assistance to participating local systems in planning, implementing, and evaluating their parent/child programs. The major activities of the regional project were directed toward this objective, considered the most important in terms of need and staff time.

What kinds of activities did the regional project emphasize?

In order to provide the kinds of assistance needed by local parent/child programs, the regional project carried out four main strategies for reaching or contacting local programs: conferences, on-site visits, individual consultant assistance, and distribution of information by mail.

What kinds of conferences were held?

Altogether, four implementation conferences were conducted by the regional project this first year. The first was an orientation meeting held in July for the administrators and staff of the projects invited to participate in the regional effort. The meeting was organizational in nature and provided an overview to local programs of the purposes and plans of the regional Parent Education Demonstration Project.

The second conference was actually a series of four smaller two-day meetings, each attended by the participating projects from two states: in September, Alabama and Mississippi at Birmingham, and North and South Carolina at Columbia; in October, Tennessee and Kentucky at Jackson, and Florida and Georgia at Atlanta. Mainly a working session, each meeting resulted in completed Planning and Implementation Charts for each local parent/child program. The purposes of the charts were (1) to provide a format with which each program could present its plans for the activities it would carry out toward meeting each stated objective, the time frame for those activities, the documentation planned for the activities, and the evaluation of the activities, and (2) to provide for the regional project and for outside evaluators a comprehensive but succinct description of the activities planned by each program.

In February the third implementation conference involved more than 50 educators from within and outside of Region IV, most of whom were staff of PEDP's participating programs. In this two-day conference, participants interacted with the staff of three agencies providing technical assistance through the Office of Child Development: the Clinch-Powell Educational Cooperative in Tazewell, Tennessee; the Top of Alabama Regional Educational Service Agency (TARESA) in Huntsville; and Nova University in Fort Lauderdale. Group presentations gave participants an overview of the interest areas, and small-group workshops allowed them a chance to learn specifics and to interact with the specialists. The topics offered during the two days were: child development theory, curriculum, and materials; parents with handicapped children; an infancy program; using community resources; developing adults' potential; techniques for working with adults; administration; parent workshops and home follow up; and staff development.

In May interested educators from the region were invited to a two-day conference in Hollywood, Florida. The theme "Families and Schools: Alliance for Learning" allowed a variety of topics and presentations from which participants could select those of interest to them. By the morning of the second day, 500 persons had registered, many of whom were teachers from Broward County who received inservice credit for attendance. Several parent groups also "dropped in" to attend small group sessions. The program offered two general sessions and 28 small interest group sessions, some of which were repeated. Evaluations of the smaller sessions indicated that nearly all were relevant to participant needs, interesting, and specific. A full report of this conference is available from SACS.

What occurred during the on-site visits?

The PEDP was committed to making at least two visits to each of the 31 participating projects during the year. The geographical dispersion of the projects made travel time-consuming, and an average of two days per project was required. Nevertheless, the value to a regional effort of on-site visits cannot be underestimated. Project staff or their representatives talked with local staff, met administrators, became acquainted with home visitors and other teachers, and compiled a more accurate and complete picture of each project's strategies and activities than was possible from reading a proposal. Problems of planning and implementation were discussed, and assistance or suggestions were offered to local staff whenever possible. The first round of on-site visits was made with the intention of gathering general information on the operations of each project, its problems, solutions to problems, and suggestions of ways in which the regional PEDP could assist. As PEDP staff became more familiar with the actual workings of each parent/child program, s/he was able to carry more information from one program to another and in that way act as a dissemination agent or linking agent. The second round of visits resulted in detailed information on the costs of components and activities of the programs, with the intent of helping administrators plan future parent/child programs in school systems. An on-site visit form allowed PEDP staff to gather similar kinds of information from all local programs.

How were individual consultants provided to participating programs?

The one way in which the PEDP could channel funds directly into local programs was through the consultant assistance component. Limited funds were available to support the expenses of an individual whose assistance was requested by the director of a local parent/child program. The only stipulation was that such assistance be directed toward staff development or toward helping the local program staff become more competent in some aspect of implementing a parent/child program. For example, the PEDP would support the expenses of a consultant who trained staff in the techniques of working with adults, but not of one who actually conducted parent workshops. Six participating projects took advantage of the availability of funds for consultants.

What information was distributed by mail to participating projects?

Regular mailings were made to the directors of participating projects at least monthly, usually more often. The items consisted of announcements of conferences or other activities related to parent education in the region, brochures or information on materials for parents and/or staff, copies of relevant articles or studies, bibliographies, and miscellaneous bits of information appropriate to project interests. Altogether, at least 20 different items were distributed to project directors. One of the 20, a reprint of an article "How To Put Your TV To Work," was requested by several projects for parent groups, and 650 were provided.

Also, although the PEDP was not intended to act as a regional clearinghouse, over time it accumulated several kinds of materials for parents and/or staff of parent programs. These were offered on a loan basis to participating programs.

Did the PEDP develop any materials?

Developing materials of any sort was not originally part of the project's purposes. However, early in the year it became apparent that school systems conducting parent/child programs needed an instrument to measure changes in parents' attitudes, knowledges, and skills as a result of being involved in a special program. Such an instrument was not available to the participating programs, and consequently each program constructed its own measurement of progress or change in parents. Also, one apparent difficulty with the evaluation of all parent/child programs across the region was the lack of common

measurement instruments for parents. The regional project's Advisory Committee approved the project's undertaking the selection or development of an appropriate instrument for measuring change in parents who were involved in parent/child programs. It was also thought feasible to look toward measuring staff attitudes as well.

How were the parent attitude survey and staff attitude survey developed?

Actually, the development of any measurement instrument is a long and arduous process. Since time was critical, the PEDP searched for an available instrument which could be adopted or adapted. Earl Schaefer, Director of the Parent/Child Interaction Project at the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, and his staff had been working on a series of interaction instruments over the years. The possibility of using any or all of these instruments for the purposes of the PEDP and the 31 local parent/child programs was suggested by Dr. Schaefer, a member of the PEDP Advisory Committee. An ad hoc task force of five directors of local projects and three members of the Advisory Committee's Evaluation Subcommittee met February 5 in Atlanta to review the available instruments and to make suggestions for their use by PEDP. In limiting the task, this working group recommended focusing on attitudes of parents since the cognitive skills and knowledge "taught" by each parent/child program were too varied to make a single instrument appropriate. The task force was interested in two surveys previously developed by Earl Schaefer and his staff. One was a parent attitude survey; the other was a staff attitude survey. The group also made specifications for the revision of these instruments in order to meet the needs of locally-operated parent/child programs. Dr. Schaefer and his staff then revised the instruments on the basis of these specifications.

Were the parent attitude survey and the staff attitude survey field tested?

Both surveys in their original forms had been tested by Dr. Schaefer's Parent/Child Interaction Project. However, after the revisions it was thought best to try them out again, this time with the kinds of parents and staff who would be ultimately using them. Five parent/child programs participating in the regional project were invited to become trial sites for the revised parent attitude survey. All agreed to cooperate by securing two persons from the community to be interviewers, one black and one white (if the parent/child program involved both ethnic groups). The ten interviewers had a one-day training session in which they were informed of the purposes of their work and of interviewing procedures and were given practice with the parent attitude interview form. From the five local programs, 100 mothers were randomly selected to respond to questions relating to their attitudes toward school, children, their role in the education of their children, the program in which they were participating, and so on. The responses were compiled and analyzed by the staff of the Parent/Child Interaction Project and are reported in a paper submitted to the Parent Education Demonstration Project (available upon request). The parent attitude survey was judged feasible for use with parents in programs conducted by school systems, with minor revisions.

As for the staff attitude survey, copies were mailed to all participating projects for completion by project staff. As a comparison, the contact person in the central office of each school system was invited to ask selected non-project staff to complete the survey. Results of this small study will be reported to the PEDP and will be available upon request.

How did the participating programs rate the services of the regional project?

At the end of the year, all directors of participating programs were invited to complete a brief form containing 12 items. Each item related to a specific activity of the regional project, beginning with its first implementation meeting in July 1975. Directors were asked to rate each item in terms of its usefulness or value on a scale of 0 to 4, with a "not

applicable" category. NA would be circled, for instance, if staff from a local program were unable to attend a certain conference. Of the 31 directors, 25 returned the rating form.

The majority of responding directors rated every item 3 or 4, with the exception of loan service for materials and availability of consultant funds. The loan service was begun fairly late in the project year and included only a few items; most directors circled the "not applicable" category. Since only six programs had taken advantage of consultant funds from PEDP, most directors indicated "not applicable" for this item also.

Those services which the program directors rated high for usefulness or value were the last two conferences, on-site visits, and systematic mailings of materials and announcements (19 or more of the 25 directors rated the value of these items as 3 or 4.) All conferences together received an average rating of 3.1. On-site visits were rated higher, on an average, than other services (3.3). Still in a positive direction but receiving fewer ratings of 3 or 4 were referrals to materials and specialists, program suggestions, and other conferences (an average rating of 2.8).

An "other" category was offered to allow directors to add any services not mentioned on the form. Among those which were added and assigned a 4 rating were: evaluation and evaluator's input, sharing at meetings and conferences, information on funding sources and on other projects, and the February task force meeting for adaptation of the attitude surveys.

Apparently what the program directors considered of most value were activities which offered them direct opportunity for professional development—training conferences, receipt of materials by mail, and personal contact with other individuals in the field.

Evaluation Process

A system was established by the staff of the Education Improvement Program for the external evaluation of the 31 parent/child programs participating in the Parent Education Demonstration Project. The contract with the Office of Education called for an external evaluation, and the project's planning paper described the kinds of information which would be collected by evaluators. The evaluations were managed by the Education Improvement Program working closely with staff of the PEDP.

Who were the evaluators and how were they trained?

A group of 15 professionals from around the region were selected on the basis of their experience and expertise (see Appendix C). Most were assigned to two parent/child programs; a few, because of travel arrangements and other considerations, were assigned to three. The evaluators met as a group twice during the year. At the initial meeting in the fall, they were acquainted with the purposes and activities of the PEDP and became familiar with the evaluation forms on which they would submit their reports. Most of the group were able to meet again in the spring to discuss a revised data-gathering form and their experiences in visiting parent/child programs.

How often did evaluators visit the parent/child programs?

The original plan called for two visits to each program by the assigned evaluator, one in the fall and the second late in the spring. An interim visit was possible but the decision on this was left to the discretion of individual evaluators. Because the PEDP continually added participating projects throughout the fall, the evaluators met late in the project year and made their first visits in January and February, somewhat later than originally planned. Second visits were scheduled as late in the project year as possible to allow program directors to gather information and to complete their work. Most of the second visits were made at the end of May and the beginning of June.

What kinds of information were gathered by evaluators?

The development of the evaluation design was based on two major program objectives which the participating parent/child programs seemed to have in common:

1. To help parents develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for their encouraging their children's cognitive, emotional, social, and motor development to the fullest.
2. To utilize the resources of school systems effectively for parent education in order to develop positive relationships between home and school, to arrange learning situations for parents, and to support and assist parents as they teach their children.

The forms used by evaluators and those used by PEDP staff during on-site visits were designed to gather information which would help answer as many of the following questions as possible:

1. What techniques, procedures, and materials are especially effective in helping parents develop new knowledge, skills, and attitudes as these relate to their children's development?
2. What positive changes can be observed in parents' knowledge and skills?
3. What kinds of staff development activities are necessary for successful parent education projects? How extensive need staff development be? What are the staff development needs of typical school system which has not previously implemented a parent education project?

5. As a result of the parent education project, what changes in attitudes may be observed in project staff? local school administration? associated teachers?
6. What kinds of attitude changes can be observed in parents toward their role in the education of their children? their relationship to the school?
7. What activity is there in the local system to extend the influence of the project to the rest of the school system? to the community?
7. What activity is there in the local system to extend the influence of the project to the rest of the school system? to the community?
8. To what extent is the local system and/or institution involved in the project? How is it involved?
9. How does the school communicate with parents?
10. How does the school or project involve the parents in the education of his child? in other school/project activities?

In addition, some demographic information was gathered on randomly selected parents involved in parent/child programs and on the staff of these programs. Some assessment was made also of the appropriateness of program activities in achieving stated objectives and of internal evaluation procedures.

What difficulties were encountered?

The questions listed above represent the kinds of information which the PEDP ultimately would like to be able to answer about parent/child programs in school systems. Not all can be answered at the end of one year. One reason for this is that instruments to reflect attitudes or to measure attitude changes in parents and staff were not available. However, the instruments adapted and field tested by PEDP during the first year will be available for use at the beginning of the second year. Hence, all of the questions relating to attitudes and expectations can be answered now only from observation and in generalities.

Most of the information gathered this year by evaluators and by project staff related to the first question about techniques, procedures, and materials which seem to work best in parent/child programs, and to the third question on staff development. Information on costs of implementing a parent/child program in a school was also carefully compiled and analyzed.

Another difficulty was the time required beyond the completion of program activities to compile and analyze evaluation data. With participating programs, as well as with the PEDP, this analysis ran well into the summer. Often evaluators were unable to gather the results of children's tests because their administration or analysis wasn't complete.

How was the information gathered by evaluators analyzed?

All completed forms were submitted to the University of Alabama, College of Education, for compilation and analysis, as agreed upon in a subcontract. The interim report submitted to the Education Improvement Program is voluminous and arranges information on parent/child programs in two formats for easy retrieval. The second report to EIP (not available at the time of this writing) will be based on the evaluators' final visits and on information and ratings provided by program directors. Preliminary findings, however, show that on a scale of 0 to 3 the elements of parent/child programs which received the highest ratings from evaluators were (1) the appropriateness of activities for stated objectives and (2) the structure of the objectives themselves. The two lowest average ratings assigned by the evaluators of parent/child programs were in the areas of (1) data analysis procedures and (2) the appropriateness of evaluation instruments and their sensitivity for measuring the range, scope, and nature of the desired behaviors.

Services of Parent/Child Programs

During 1975-76, 31 locally-operated parent/child programs participated in the Region IV Parent Education Demonstration Project. All of the descriptive information about their activities, staffing, and budgeting presented here is a compilation of the reports of site visits made by project staff and evaluators. Much time was spent extracting the common characteristics of all projects and identifying the uncommon characteristics. Each of four common delivery patterns was considered important enough to warrant a separate discussion section.

What were the major delivery patterns for parent/child programs?

Parent/child programs in school systems implemented one or all of four major delivery patterns (hereafter called *components*): parent training workshops, home visiting, a toy material library, and classroom instruction for the children. Parent workshops and the home visitor components were primarily for instruction to parents; preschool classrooms were primarily for instruction to children. The toy library served as a complement to the other components. An occasional parent/child program operated another component to complement the major delivery strategies, e.g. a sibling reading program in which older brothers and sisters were rewarded for reading books to preschoolers, or the involvement of high schoolers in preschool classes as part of a structured course of study (Exploring Childhood or Parent Readiness Education Project), or a regular newsletter to parents.

Did the typical parent/child program operate all of these delivery patterns or components?

Six programs operated only one of the four major components; eight programs offered two components; thirteen others offered three; and four programs had all four components. The combinations of components selected by the parent/child programs varied a great deal, helping to make each program different from every other one. Here are the number of programs selecting each of the combinations:

Number of programs	Component Combination
3	Parent workshops only
3	Home visiting only
4	Parent workshop and home visiting
2	Parent workshops and toy library
2	Home visiting and toy library
4	Parent workshops, home visiting, and toy library
5	Parent workshops, home visiting, and preschool class
1	Parent workshops, home visiting, and mobile class
3	Parent workshops, toy library, and preschool class
3	Parent workshops, home visiting, toy library, and mobile class
1	Parent workshops, home visiting, toy library, and preschool class

What other services did parent/child programs offer?

Frequently health and social services were offered, especially in the Title I and Title III programs. Sometimes such services were shared with other federally-funded programs. In one program dental and pediatric care was donated by local dentists and physicians when needed. Eye and hearing tests, speech tests, and motor development tests often

were given to preschoolers at some time (usually early) in the year. The staff of most programs considered it their responsibility to assist their families in whatever way they could—referral to social services offices, health care, enrollment in the adult education program, and so on.

Who were the families being served?

In the parent/child programs funded under Title I and the one locally-supported program, the families were typical of those usually referred to as disadvantaged—low socioeconomic level, low educational level. Most Title III programs also served this population, but because of different guidelines and purposes of funding, the types of families varied more than in Title I programs. Average annual income ranged from less than $4,000 to $17,000, yet most had preschoolers enrolled in special projects. (The exceptions were the parents involved in two programs funded to develop and try out products for parents.) Demographic data were gathered from randomly selected parents in most programs. (Understandably, a few programs and some individuals declined to offer this information because of its sensitivity.) A total of 686 parents responded to the question of age. This is how their age grouping fell:

Age range	Number of parents (%)
18-25	178 (25.9%)
26-30	173 (25.2%)
31-35	139 (20.4%)
36-40	110 (16.0%)
41 +	86 (12.5%)

Information on parents' occupations was not always complete, and because of the large number indicating the "other" category, the conclusion was made to define categories more completely in the future. Regardless of these problems, this is what 487 parents' occupational profile looked like:

Clerical	37 (8%)
Mechanical	24 (5%)
Professional	28 (6%)
Service	69 (14%)
Skilled	114 (23%)
Other	111 (63%)
Not employed	104 (21%)

In the 13 ESAA programs, all parents had children involved in ESAA classes, and most had preschoolers at home as well. This usually meant that the families had at least one child functioning at a low level in reading and/or math. Emphasis in the parent components of ESAA programs was on developing parent skills which would help the school-age child as well as the younger children at home.

How were parents notified of the programs and recruited into them?

By far the most successful procedures for contacting parents about the available parent/child programs were (1) personal contact by program staff and (2) parents telling other parents, in an "each one reach one" kind of system. Often the ways in which parents were personally contacted were clever and impromptu—at the grocery store, at bus stops, in automatic laundries, in a toy-filled yard. These kinds of techniques were most likely to be used by Title III and I programs which were not formally related to a school-level program. ESAA directors, on the other hand, tended to consider sending letters home with ESAA children as the most successful way of notifying parents of a special program for them.

Other ways of making parents aware of a parent/child program were newspaper articles, school/community newsletters, posters, talks at PTA meetings and at church or civic group meetings, and direct mail. Television was used by two of the programs for awareness or recruiting information but was not ranked among the top three most successful techniques. Three directors arranged for radio spots and considered them as the third most successful technique.

Did the Title I, Title III, and ESAA programs operate differently?

Quite differently as to focus of objectives, delivery strategies, and staffing. The Title I and Title III programs because of the nature of funding focused mainly on parents of preschoolers emphasizing frequent, individual contact and a curriculum of parenting skills. ESAA programs, on the other hand, by design were school-related, focused on children's reading and math achievement, and included a parent component as only one part of the elementary or secondary project.

The non-ESAA programs usually employed special staff to conduct activities; ESAA programs, in contrast, usually tended to rely on already-employed teachers to take on additional responsibilities for the parent component, sometimes for supplemental salary. Some ESAA programs did, however, hire individuals to coordinate the parent education activities.

Usually ESAA programs selected the parent workshop strategy. In the four which had some visitors, the school's remedial teacher identified a child's deficiency to a resource or human development teacher who communicated this to the program staff. The home visitor then delivered appropriate materials and instruction to the parent at home. In two programs, however, the classroom aide sent the materials and instruction home with the student and checked it in a few days later. In most cases, however, the program's major contact with parents was through workshops.

Were there any unexpected benefits from the parent/child programs?

Many program directors reported spinoffs from their parent/child programs. These were advantages or results which were not foreseen as achievements of the program. Some of those mentioned were:

- the securing of jobs by several parents as a result of program involvement
- the development of leadership skills by some parents
- a better understanding by parents of the school system
- a new dimension of attitudes and understandings achieved by counselors and teachers of child development *and* parents
- the spread of the main concepts of the program to other professionals in the system, either informally or through structured staff development
- the establishment of an advisory committee for parent education (in a program where this was not a requirement)
- the observed improvement in school of older siblings whose parents were involved in a preschool program
- a reorganization of the school's PTA which had previously been inactive
- an involvement by university and college faculty in public school activities
- financial contributions to the program from individuals feeling strongly about their involvement
- the enrollment of participating parents in adult education classes
- an increase in the number of expectant mothers attending sessions for parents
- the development of specific career goals by high school students who were involved in preschool program
- increased parent participation in all school activities, not only those related to the program
- greater awareness by school administrators and school board of importance of parental involvement

Parent Workshops

One of the basic strategies for reaching parents, usually mothers, in a parent/child program was through group workshops. Group meetings or workshops were held by 26 of the 31 parent/child programs participating in the regional Parent Education Demonstration Project. In eight of these programs, workshops constituted the only means of teaching parenting skills. Fifteen parent-child programs included both the workshop and home visitor approaches, and of these about one-half considered the workshops (held at least monthly) as the main contact with parents, providing the basic content or knowledge. In these cases the home visit was seen as a follow-up to the workshops.

How often did the parent/child programs hold workshops?

Of the 26 programs conducting parent workshops, 6 held workshops twice a month, 12 met monthly, and 8 conducted less frequent workshops (bimonthly or quarterly). The exact number of workshops depended on when the program actually began operating and on the number of holidays to be considered in scheduling. A twice-monthly schedule provided 11 to 18 sessions; monthly, 8 to 10 sessions. Those programs with a bimonthly workshop schedule held four to six sessions during the year; those with a quarterly schedule, three or four sessions. Looking at all of the programs, all with a different workshop schedule, the frequency of sessions during the year ranged from 3 to 18 for any one program.

When during the week were workshops held?

Although the frequency of parent workshops was usually established in the program's proposal, the time, place, and details were determined by the staff's concern for maximum participation. Most of the workshops were held on week nights, but many programs opted for daytime workshops, either morning or afternoon but within school hours. One or two of these felt restricted to daytime sessions because of the expense of using a school building at night. Two programs held parent workshops on Saturday, one so that fathers could attend, and the other by vote of the parents themselves.

Where were parent workshops held?

Almost all of the programs used an elementary school, preschool center, or other school-related location. Only one program rented a large facility for its few workshops. Some made an effort to escape the "school" image and located in community buildings, housing projects, shopping centers, and churches. Locations like these also seemed more convenient at times for parents. Except for a few isolated incidents, a change in the location of workshops did not greatly affect attendance.

How long did most workshops last?

Most of the parent workshops were 2 or 2½ hours long. A few lasted 1½ hours, and only one was limited to one hour. The usual 2 or 2½ hours was appropriate for the typical three-part pattern of most workshops—program, refreshments, and a work activity (not necessarily occurring in that order).

Were workshops repeated in order to reach a greater number of parents?

Of the 26 parent/child programs with a workshop component, 14 presented each of their workshops more than once. Many of them gave a repeat performance in the morning following an evening session in order to reach both working and nonworking parents.

Others repeated the same workshop in each of several schools, centers, or community locations. Many of these "repeating" schedules required tremendous effort from program staff. For example, one ESAA project had scheduled three quarterly workshops but each time presented the same workshop at 17 schools! Another gave Saturday workshops in the morning at one school and in the afternoon at another. A third with three ESAA schools ran two sessions each month on three successive nights (one for each school). Another offered each workshop for two consecutive weeks and assigned parents to one or the other. The scheduling patterns were as varied as the programs themselves.

How were parents notified of scheduled workshops?

The typical procedure for reminding or notifying parents of a scheduled workshop was to send a note home with the school children or to have the home visitor drop it off during her visits. Several programs at first mailed meeting notices to each family; only one or two continued this practice because of the expense of postage and addressing. Those programs which produced newsletters timed their publication to serve as a notice of the meeting. A few programs telephoned selected parents likely to need the reminder messages. One program provided each family with a marked calendar when the family joined the program. Most program directors did not seem to feel that they had a completely successful system for informing the parents or building enthusiasm for attendance at each meeting.

What was the content of parent workshops?

For many parent/child programs, the content for the workshop component had been outlined in the proposal in fairly specific detail. Often this was based on a need or interest survey, and sometimes on professional rationale. For many other programs, the stated objectives offered the only guidance for determining content and procedures of the parent instruction. Thus, the instructional content offered to parents was unique to each program and often reflected the background and training of the director.

Several programs based their parent workshops on multi-topic and multi-media commercially available materials such as American Guidance's *Systematic Training for Effective Parenting; Parent Magazine's, Understanding Early Childhood Series*; a ten cassette program, *How To Involve Parents; Parent Power* materials from Detroit's Parent Readiness Education Project; *Brushing Up on Parenthood*, from the Institute on Family Education; a series of six videotapes from Parents As Resource, Inc., and others.

Several programs had a basic philosophy which tended to provide content to their workshops. Most common was the conviction that parents should take something home for use with their children; hence, much workshop time was spent making toys, pinwheels, puppets, arithmetic games, and other materials for home use. Other programs, with the conviction that learning should be fun for the child, devoted much time to playing the child games (complete with prizes) that parents were to play at home with their children. Some played the Child-O Bingo game developed by the Murfreesboro program, giving prizes and discussing the content of some of the squares. Almost all of the prizes offered were items for educational use with the child at home. One program concentrated its sessions on problems raised by parents about child growth and development. Several individual topics were mentioned frequently by directors as being necessary and effective. Among them were spending time wisely with your child, learning disabilities, health and nutrition, dental hygiene, prereading skills, language development, pre-arithmetic skills, discipline and child management, and self image.

Who actually conducted the parent workshops?

Four parent/child programs contracted the operation of their parent workshops to university-based persons or other organizations, and one employed a consultant to assure that the

sessions would be activity oriented. In all other programs, workshop planning and operation was a responsibility of the project director. Frequently, the lack of funds also required that the director and other project staff also present the workshop or find free resource persons who would. Workshops in which the parents made things for instructional use seemed very appropriate and became the dominant pattern.

School-based programs frequently received the cooperation and help of kindergarten and primary grade teachers and, in one ESAA project school, all ESAA staff were expected to attend and to assist with either parent training or to work with the children who accompanied the parents. Several programs received almost 100% voluntary attendance from ESAA staff. A few other programs employed selected members of the teaching staff to participate as trainers or resource staff in the workshops. Salaries ranged from $2 to $7 per hour, but $3.50 and $6.50 seemed to be standard amounts.

What kinds of resource persons were involved in parent sessions?

Some special sessions were offered by many parent/child programs because resource persons, or consultants were easily available—the Extension Service, Health Department, fire, police and the library, among the government agencies; the dairy council, and local medical and dental societies among professional associations; the newspaper and bakery, among local businesses; the film libraries of the state and nearby universities; and individual school staff such as counselors, psychologists, speech, hearing, and learning disabilities specialists. Fewer than one-third of the programs had funds or wished to hire consultants to conduct workshops, and about half of the programs seemed to actively solicit these resources because they were appropriate and free. Two or three programs recently discovered and enthusiastically endorsed the regional representative of the Children's TV Network, who is available to teach parents how to use *Sesame Street*, to make appropriate items for instruction, and to distribute the TV instructional schedule.

Typically, what kinds of things occurred during a parent workshop?

A typical pattern, as mentioned before, consisted of the presentation of a program topic and related discussion, refreshment, and a work activity. This was usually the order of activities although some sessions began with refreshments as an ice breaker. The part of this pattern which varied most from one parent/child program to another was the presentation of the topic or the concepts to be discussed. Topics were most often introduced by a "speaker" (project director, consultant, or resource person); sometimes audiotapes or videotapes were used.

Some of the most successful parent sessions revolved around an uncommon format in which children accompanied their parents to the meeting but were grouped together in another room, later to rejoin the adults for a group activity. The children experienced some kind of instruction by teachers, volunteers, or paraprofessionals while their parents held their own session elsewhere. Often the instructional activities for parents and children were complementary, e.g. a parent session on nutrition while children were involved with non-heat cooking, or parents' producing an arithmetic game while children were doing number or arithmetic activities.

Frequently the last part of each parent meeting was reserved for checking items out from the toy and material library, or planning home activities to be discussed at the next meeting.

Almost every parent/child program had at least one parent workshop or one technique that was especially effective. These are some of the more successful ones which were reported.

1. To open the meeting, each teacher and home visitor recounted his/her best experience of the past month.

2. Upon arrival, each parent was asked to write down the things s/he liked best about his/her child. Then the group discussed the best ways to let their children know this.
3. A local toy store and a record shop displayed more than $600 worth of materials. The meeting then focused on safety, instruction, and training potential of the displayed materials.
4. A different direction sheet for making and using a simple instructional toy was distributed to each parent. When construction was completed, each parent demonstrated use of the toy, with another parent role playing the part of a child. The result was greater empathy from the parents toward the home visitors.
5. Videotapes of the teachers working with the children were shown to the parents with explanations and critiques. Occasionally these same tapes and meeting highlights were shown again to remind parents of the previous instruction.
6. At the first parent meeting (for orientation) each parent went through the typical day, role playing his/her child.
7. Upon arriving, each parent was given a copy of a puzzle to put together but all had either an extra piece or a piece missing. The person with a missing piece could only wait until a person with the extra one offered it.
8. Each last half-hour was called "sharing time" which the parents frequently converted into an opportunity to raise their own specific problems.
9. The work room was dominated by a huge display of "Things you can count at home" with all kinds of items and containers which could be used with children for sorting, comparing, classifying, and counting.
10. Videotapes were made of parents working with their children and were immediately reviewed for reinforcement of good techniques and identification of those which needed improvement. (Most frequent result was that parents discovered they had a habit of mumbling.)
11. A panel of health specialists, including a pediatrician, a dentist, and the project nurse, responded to health and behavior questions raised by parents, preschool classroom teachers, and home visitors.
12. A presentation by the regional representative of the Children's Television Workshop taught the parents how to make several unusual things, how to use "Sesame Street," and explained the television scheduling. Another unusually productive session was presented by authoress Hortense Jones from New York City who directed the parents in making several of the items from her book. Both of these persons are readily available. The CTW also has a person available in each two-and three-state area to explain "Electric Company" to teachers and parents of school-age children.

What about refreshments?

Refreshments were almost always provided, most of the time at program expense, which ranged from $2 to $300 (the latter when one program held three large sessions). The typical expense for simple refreshments was $10 per meeting but about 10 programs had not budgeted for this. Program staff and occasionally the school principal or parent committee provided snacks and a drink.

What other incentives did parent/child programs offer to parents?

Every program was quite concerned about parent participation at workshops, and many made changes in operation to increase participation. Twenty-two programs provided transportation (many times volunteered by program staff) or arranged for transportation upon request. Two programs provided to each parent a transportation and baby-sitting

allowance. Other incentives for participation included certificates for attending an agreed-upon number of meetings, door prizes, and prizes for winners of games. Sometimes the prizes were for the personal use of the parent, but most often they were for parents to use in working with their children (book, game, puzzle, crayons). One program gave each parent a transparent vinyl notebook with pockets and a composition book so that workshop materials could be easily carried and stored.

To maintain parent interest, many programs involved parents in planning future meetings and in setting the schedule for meetings at times and places most convenient to them. Once this was done, the majority of programs used written reminders and phone calls to let parents know they were expected at a scheduled meeting.

About how many parents attended the workshops?

Program directors reported that occasionally attendance at a special meeting was excellent, but that most of the time from 10% to 30% was their typical turnout at a workshop. Only two programs reported more than 50% consistent attendance, and three others estimated their typical attendance to be nearly 50%. A good estimate is that the multiple sessions made it possible for from one-third to one-half of the parent participants to attend about three-fourths of the workshops.

Some workshops were poorly attended because of inclement weather, inconvenient time or place, poor programming, no transportation, loss of interest through infrequent scheduling, and spring and fall farm work patterns. Several project directors blamed poor attendance on competition from several other projects. ESAA, Child Development Programs for Welfare Mothers, Title I, and Head Start, they said, operated parent involvement programs and could exert more pressure or had more incentive for participation than they did. Many of the consortium school districts, it should be noted, operated other programs under Title I, Head Start, or ESAA grants serving the disadvantaged population. At least three programs, for example, occasionally held joint parent sessions with another kind of program—ESAA, Project Outreach, Project Follow Through, Title I or Title III.

In addition to instructional workshops, what other kinds of parent meetings were held?

Other types of parent involvement sessions were held in nine of the programs which conducted regularly scheduled workshops. Several of these—such as monthly activity days (for making things), special workshops for fathers, and field trips—were for everyone in the program. Others were for special subgroups and included parent committees, special workshops, and social affairs. Such a variety of possibilities often demonstrated the commitment of program directors. Two, for example, organized and conducted a different kind of parent session each week.

What about the cost of parent workshops?

Generally, except for the few programs which had budgeted for consultants or subcontract work, the parent workshops were a relatively inexpensive component of a total parent/child program, which explains why it was not frequently considered the primary mode for teaching parenting skills. The project staff provided most of the labor involved; school or program facilities were used; training and program materials, although expensive, were purchased for staff development as well as parent training. Consumable materials averaged about $50 per session and usually were already on hand for use in the classroom or home visitor component.

Home Visiting

Of the 31 parent/child programs participating in the Parent Education Demonstration Project, 22 operated a home visiting component, but the number of persons who made home visits varied greatly, as did their professional background, the frequency of making visits, and their assigned responsibilities and tasks. In three programs, home visiting was the only component, and in two others, home visiting was supplemented only by a toy library. Only in these five programs did the home visitor provide the chief instruction. For almost all programs the home visiting component supplemented the parent group sessions.

Who were the home visitors?

In nearly all of the parent/child programs the home visitors were employed as paraprofessionals. Exceptions to this occurred in one product development project which used elementary school counselors half-time to make home visits, and in two programs which employed teachers who added the parent activity to their regular workday. In these two programs the parent contactor either saw the parents at school or made home visits only twice during the year.

Home Visitor was the usual title, but some were referred to as Field Assistants, Community Aides or Leaders, or Home-School Coordinators. All of them were responsible to or supervised by professionally trained employees. These included project directors, assistant directors, the ESAA program director, or an assistant ESAA director assigned as administrator of the parent education component. Two or three programs, in contrast, placed their home visitors under the leadership of the preschool classroom teacher or under a resource teacher or other ESAA teacher from the school program.

What were their backgrounds?

The range of qualifications of the paraprofessionals varied greatly; many were college graduates, one or two had a master's degree. The majority had a high school diploma, with and without some college credits, and one or two had not finished high school. Usually parent/child programs employed someone from among the community they were serving and then trained them in the principles of child development and in the techniques of visiting mothers at home. Such persons seemed to have good rapport with parents and could "speak their language." They were usually trained to become home visitors by the program director during the first weeks of program operation. Such training, however, was not usually considered as sufficient, and staff development continued during inservice days throughout the year.

What were the roles and responsibilities of the home visitor?

Two contrasting philosophies prevailed about the role of home visitors. In one, the home visitor was seen as an important instructional agent, with either a direct teaching role or, less commonly, a demonstrator role. The other philosophy saw the home visitor as only a facilitator, one who strengthens the training of parent workshops or provides other kinds of services to the family. Ira Gordon *et al.*, in *Parent Oriented Home-Based Early Childhood Education Programs*, described well these roles.

> Within the *teacher* role, some programs stress the home visitor as the teacher of the parent, some as teacher of child, and some as teacher of parent-child in interaction with each other. Major philosophical differences emerge in the specificity of the home visitor as teacher. In some programs, the home visitor is encouraged to increase the amount of parent-child interaction in terms of autonomy-granting on the part of the parent, improvement of the affective climate and the general inter-change

of parent-child dialogue. In other programs, the effort is more closely related to teaching the parent behavior modification skills for working with the child. There is usually a connection between the home visitor role definition (i.e., home visitor as teacher of parent), and the curriculum content (i.e., specificity and sequence). Generally then the home visitor as teacher is attempting to create an image in the mind of the parent as teacher, broadly defined, as well as to use specific management techniques and to teach those techniques to the parent to use with the child.

The home visitor as *demonstrator* generally rests on the rationale that the parent learns through modeling rather than necessarily through direct instruction.

A third role is that of *facilitator*. In programs which utilize this approach, the focus of the home visitor is on understanding the family's needs and providing forms of support to the family which may not include any formal instruction of the mother or any formal delivery of material. In this case the facilitator is a responder to the parent rather than an initiator of activities. Facilitation can be either responding to what is occurring in the family structure or an ombudsman-type role of connecting the family to needed social services. Some programs include direct facilitation through the home visitor in that the program itself provides comprehensive social services. Other programs train the home visitor as a referral agent to external agencies who then provide the appropriate service.

As Gordon *et al.* found in their survey of parent programs, these roles may not be mutually exclusive and indeed may overlap a great deal. Such overlapping is not necessarily undesirable. They did recommend, however, that "program developers clearly define the home visitor role and recognize the relationships between curriculum content, role definition, and philosophical orientation."

What major tasks did the home visitor carry out?

The work pattern of the home visitor greatly depended on the frequency of the parent workshops. With frequent sessions, the home visitor's task was to see that the parent performed the instructional assignments. With less frequent sessions, her task was to provide additional and supplementary materials and activities. And with infrequent sessions, the home visitor worked with the child and parent to provide instruction to the child and training to the parent so that the parent would be involved in additional instruction. In one program, it should be mentioned, the chief task of the home visitor was to help the family solve or reduce problems rather than train the parents as teachers. Several of the programs began with the home visitor expending her chief effort in instructing the child while the parent observed, but the pattern shifted to the home visitor's acting as a consultant as the parent worked with the child. Often home visitors delivered toys, books, or other materials for the parent and child to work with until the next visit.

What other services did the home visitor perform?

The number of supplemental tasks and responsibilities was extensive. Almost all of the home visitors provided transportation to parents for program events and for any other program-related activity. This included picking up and returning parents from the doctor and from all types of government and community service agencies as well as from the parent workshops and classroom activities. Similarly, almost all home visitors were expected to make their own instructional materials, plan individual instructional activities for each family, keep the teacher informed of the special needs of each child, maintain a checklist of child progress, provide child care services or share instructional duties at the parent workshops, maintain the necessary records for their assigned families, and provide whatever service was necessary to help their families remain in the program. In most cases, they had recruited their own workload and were expected to maintain it. Also, it was not unusual for a home visitor to help pay for or provide refreshments and to use her home and car to store and transport instructional materials and supplies.

How many families can one home visitor comfortably serve?

Typically the number of families assigned to each home visitor ranged from 10 to 20, but home visitors in three programs had a 30, 40, and 75 family visiting load. Many of the programs seemed to have a "rule of thumb" which assigned an average of five visits per visiting day to each home visitor (sometimes fewer in rural areas). Even with telephone calls and notes sent home with children from class, some home visitors found as many as 10% of the mothers not at home for scheduled visits. This meant that return visits had to be scheduled. A program which plans weekly home visits would do well to assign no more than 15 or 20 families to each home visitor.

Howe often were home visits made to each family?

The frequency of scheduled home visits in the participating parent/child programs ranged from two per week to two per year. When the child also attended a preschool center, the frequency of visits was often monthly; otherwise, visits were scheduled weekly. Typically a home visit lasted one hour. A few programs stopped class or center operations once a month so that the teacher or program director could accompany the home visitor. Two programs did not establish a home visit schedule but provided visits according to need—helping to solve family problems, providing special remedial help, or visiting families who did not or could not come to parent meetings.

What was the home visitor's weekly schedule?

A typical weekly work schedule included working in the preschool center or classroom one day (in the 13 projects which operate preschool classes), making materials and planning on one day, and visting homes on three days. Almost every program provided a staff development and/or workday for one-half or a full day every week. Often special meetings of the whole staff were held just prior to parent workshop sessions or other special events. Usually the home visitor work sessions were held on Friday, which came to be recognized as "office day" or "staff development" day.

About how much should be budgeted for a home visitor's salary?

Many of the school districts had a standard salary schedule for instructional aides, and home visitor staff were employed in accordance with it and without regard to their additional academic qualifications. This caused some turn-over in staff when an opening occurred on the regular teaching staff or when a better paying non-school job was found. Resignations from home visitors, however, were minimal.

At least two programs paid the home visitor by the hour ($2.75 and $3.50) and required a daily log of the hours worked. Several others required the home visitor to sign in and out but it was for monitoring purposes rather than salary. Salaries of paraprofessionals ranged from $2,500 to $6,000, but about half received salaries between $3,000 and $4,000 and a significant proportion received around $4,500. The most frequent monthly salary rates varies from $300 to $500 for a nine or ten month period. Obviously, "low pay" was a frequent complaint, but none of the directors expressed any expectation of improving this situation. Two programs, it should be added, used already employed personnel to do home visiting and paid them a small salary supplement.

How much is typically spent on travel?

All of the home visitors were reimbursed for their mileage at from 12 to 15 cents per mile, except in two programs where the home visitors received a travel allowance of $50 and $68. The range of expense for local travel varied from $15 to $125 monthly but the most typical amount was between $25 and $30 per month. The number of miles traveled varied more because of the number of services offered by home visitors than because of the distance between homes.

37

Toy/and Material Libraries

Although almost all of the 31 parent/child programs provided instructional materials or devices appropriate for learning activities as a part of their services, only 16 systematically maintained a lending library. Their facilities varied from a small storage area in the homes of staff, to small storerooms in school buildings, to display and shelf space in school and public libraries, to elaborate separate library rooms with display, shelf, and storage space and a full check-out system. Some programs maintained a single central toy library while others had duplicate toy collections in each participating school.

What kinds of materials were available to parents through the libraries?

The materials available through all of the libraries were extremely varied but all included both project-made and commercial items, in varying ratios. Common items were books, toys, puzzles, pictures, and games. Additional items in many of the libraries were blocks, pegs, beads, sandbag shapes, puppets, records, book and record sets, and talking books. A few libraries maintained wheel toys and other gross motor playthings, and kitchen and other home-area play sets. Although trade names were mentioned infrequently by project staff, several collections and individual items were given recognition, including materials from Olympus Publishing, Nova University, and Far West Educational Laboratory. These were suggested as good durable basic sets covering wide age and skill ranges but needing supplementary materials. Other non-kit materials mentioned as being good were the Alpha Worker, I Saw A Purple Cow, Scott-Foresman's Talking Books, Taylor Publisher's *Let's Visit Series*, California Phonic Kits, and the See and Touch books. Programs with larger grant amounts per staff member tended to support libraries with a good supply of commercial items; some programs with lesser grants emphasized staff- and parent-made library items.

Were the materials commercial or home-made?

The amount and type of materials selected for a library were frequently influenced by the philosophy or educational convictions of the project director. For almost all programs the amount of money spent for commercial items exceeded that spent for supplies and materials to construct loanable items; but the number of home-made items exceeded the number of purchased items. Experience, several project directors said, showed them that interest, quality of parent participation, and extent of use of the items at home were greater when the items were made as part of program activity. Also, home visit staff seemed more proficient and creative in helping parents use home-made items if they were involved in their construction. Another attitude frequently expressed was that commercial toys sometimes inhibited or restricted educational use of an item and that good instruction was often impromptu. Thus almost every home activity could be converted to a teaching opportunity if the parent were alert. Even such chores as cooking, cleaning up, and setting the table could be the basis for an educationally purposeful game. A few project directors indicated that commercial items were undesirable because they encouraged the parents to spend their money for expensive and unnecessary toys in the mistaken belief that school purchase and loan was an endorsement. There was also some feeling that expensive commercial items downgraded the acceptability of the home-made items which the project emphasized.

How did library materials reach parents?

Distribution procedures followed either of two systems. In one, the home visitors delivered the instructional game or toy to the home. In the other, time was provided at parent workshops for the parent to return items and check out others from the library. Less frequently, items were given to the child in a "tote" bag or children's kit and thus carried

home to the parent. One program distributed most library items when the parent picked up the child from the mobile classroom. The number of items loaned at any one time varied from one to four, but typically was two or three, usually one book and one game or toy. The usual number of check-outs for almost every program totaled in the thousands for the year.

What were the initial costs of the libraries?

The contents of a typical lending library installation cost about $1,500 but the amount ranged from $250 to $2,500. For multiple installations, some programs spent up to $7,000 for library items while, in contrast, others spent minimum funds (usually around $500) and supplemented their purchases with donations of both money and materials from individual, civic, and business sources. Several reported receiving substantial quantities of pamphlets and games from the Extension Service, health agencies, and professional associations.

One or two programs supplemented their toy libraries by swapping or borrowing items from Head Start or ESAA programs, and some received excess items from their school program or through the regular school library. One program arranged with the nearby regional library to assemble kits which included toys, puzzles, and books correlated with the parent training session.

Didn't a great deal of loss occur?

Replacement costs were substantial, ranging from 5% to 25%, with an average of about 12% or $200. The main problems were (1) the loss of pieces of items, (2) reluctance to return more desirable items such as writing boards, and (3) wear and tear of favorite books. This lead a few programs to restrict the kinds of items which went home in the tote bag, and a few programs stressed book loans, since books are least "loseable." Several programs took a more positive approach, such as giving the child a reward (candy, a colored star) when items were returned in good shape.

How can initial and replacement costs be reduced?

Two unique practices deserve special mention. One is the greater utility and durability of items which have been laminated. About half of the programs had access to a laminating machine and made good use of it. Project directors insisted that a laminating machine and copier are two useful and necessary pieces of equipment. Another program created small books for parents to read to their children by separating discarded school books into individual stories, and placing each story in a sturdy, laminated decorative cover with check-out information inside the back cover.

ON WHEELS
PROGRAM

Learning Programs for Preschoolers

Of the 31 parent/child programs, 13 provided group instruction for preschool children of participating parents. In addition, one other program operated concomitantly in both preschool and kindergarten through third grade classrooms provided by Project Follow-Through, another federal grant program.

Where did the preschool groups meet?

In nine of these programs, the preschool groups were located in a school or center operated by the school district; four programs used remodeled school buses or specially-equipped vans which changed locations. Most of the programs used only one or two classrooms, but three urban programs which used permanent facilities operated 5, 8, and 11 classrooms. All but one of the preschool programs enrolled more than one group of children, usually a separate group each day, four days each week. The number of children served per teacher or home visitor, the amount of time the children spent in the class, and the content and emphasis of the instructional program varied only slightly because of the limitations and advantages inherent in each kind of facility.

How old were the children served?

All but three of the programs served children three, four, and five years of age. Most of them enrolled three- and four-year-olds; some enrolled only four- and five-year-olds; and others served all three ages. The three exceptions were (1) a program which enrolled infants from birth to 36 months, (2) one which included kindergarteners through third graders, in addition to three- and four-year-olds, and (3) one program which worked with three- and four-year-olds in the classroom and also did home visiting to parents of two-year-olds. One other project encouraged parent participation in the classroom and provided child care services to younger children two days each week so their parents could work in the classrooms.

How often did children attend group sessions?

Scheduling for preschool learning groups varied as much as the types of parent/child programs. Each group usually met once a week but the number of hours ranged from one-and-one-half to four.

Number of programs with each schedule

	1½ hours	2 hours	3 hours	4 hours
One day a week	1	2	6	1
Two days a week		2	1	

Several of the center-based programs, it should be noted, suspended classes one week each month so the teacher could visit a sampling of homes with each home visitor.

How many children were in each group or class?

For most of the programs the number of children enrolled in each learning group depended on the workload assigned and successfully recruited by each home visitor and on the number of families proposed as a goal in the project proposal. Enrollment goals ranged from 10 to 25 children per home visitor or class group; most frequent actual group sizes were 10 and 15 children, but two programs enrolled 20 children per class. Usually,

the children from a geographic area served by a home visitor gathered for class at the same time, and their home visitor served as teacher aide. In programs without home visitors, enrollment was determined by the provision of transportation or parental choice.

Were lunches or refreshments served?

All but two centers served some type of refreshment to each preschool group; for the majority this was a snack which included milk. Four programs served lunch and used it as an instructional opportunity (at least two other directors expressed the wish that lunch could be a part of their programs). Parents working in the classroom at lunch time more frequently than not also were provided with lunch. For several programs, lunches were catered or provided by contract from the central school system or other programs. Snacks were frequently estimated to cost about $.15 per child and were purchased through school facilities.

What activities took place in preschool learning groups?

With few exceptions, the classroom or center served as a supplement to home visits and parent workshops. The typical learning program was organized into pre-arithmetic, pre-reading, art and creativity, language arts, manipulative activities, music, nutrition and communication. Special activities, such as physical checkups—eye, teeth, and hearing—psychological and speech tests, and immunizations, were often included as program services. Many special days were observed such as birthdays, holidays, and special community events or class field trips. Books, puzzles, toys, blocks, beads, old clothes, finger paint, a record player and a full-length mirror were standard instructional materials. The one most frequently mentioned as invaluable was the full-length mirror to help build self-concept and identity.

Were there transportation problems and how were they solved?

Stationary centers had the distinct disadvantage of immobility, and transportation to them always was a major expense and sometimes a major problem. Usually the program operated a bus which picked up children and occasionally a few parents from a different section of its service area each day. Most of the time only ten to fifteen children were scheduled for pickup, and in one or two rural areas home visitors or parents brought children to pick-up points. One program which shared a bus with another program found that a second-trip schedule was very unsatisfactory and unreliable. Too, several project directors commented that parent participation was greatly reduced because of their reluctance to ride the bus. In a few programs which provided bus transportation, some parents still preferred to bring their child to the center by car. (In one case, more than half of the parents did this.) In programs which could not provide transportation about two to four children become problem cases each day, and the home visitor or classroom aide made special arrangements or provided the transportation. At least two programs believed that one center's serving a school district was unsatisfactory and that locating in several centers would reduce the time children spent in traveling, increase parent participation, and give greater identity with the school of their community.

Do parents visit the centers very much?

Programs with stationary classrooms more frequently encouraged and scheduled parent participation because space was not a problem. Many programs had as many as 30% to 50% of the parents making occasional visits; a few scheduled one or two parents each day to work with the teacher; and a few programs required mothers to participate once a week. Only one program, which served children from birth to 36 months, based its entire instructional program on the joint participation of mother and child. Two programs, it should be noted, in school or center facilities, involved high school students with

the preschoolers. This served as a practicum for a high school course, and students received credit.

How do mobile classrooms operate?

Mobile classroom facilities have the advantage, of course, of mobility and thus reduced transportation time for children and parents. In two of the four programs with mobile classroom units, the vans traveled to a separate location each morning; in another, the unit served a separate location each morning *and* afternoon. The van for the fourth, served three locations each day: 9:00 to 10:30 a.m., 11:00-1:30 p.m., and 2:00 to 3:30 p.m. Typical locations included school yards, housing project areas, church yards, city parks, and community buildings, including an electric co-op installation. Although the Winnebago van can be self-sustaining, each location must be equipped with electrical connections on either a permanent or emergency basis. Even with an independent generator, heating during cold spells was less than desirable, and generating units proved to be expensive to maintain and disruptive because several days were needed to complete even minor repairs. Electrical installations at the sites varied in cost from $300 to almost $1,000 depending on the distance from an existing line or installation. Most of them were priced near the lower level; several of the locations, such as housing projects, provided the installation free and some absorbed the utility charges.

How much did mobile units cost?

Purchase and remodeling of a used school bus ranged from $2,000 to $6,000, most near the $6,000 level. Usually seats were removed, and floor and walls were carpeted; storage space, drop-away tables, shelving, mirror, and clothes hanging areas were permanently constructed; refrigerator, heater, air conditioner (sometimes) and educational equipment were installed; the floor area remained as open as possible.

How many children can a mobile unit comfortably serve at one time?

Even with as much open floor area as possible, eight to ten children, the home visitor, and teacher found the quarters crowded but adequate. In one program, a mini-bus brought half the children to the mobile unit in the morning and the second group about noon when all ate lunch together. The morning group then was taken home, with the mini-bus returning in time to take the second group home. The driver/aide spent the few minutes between trips as an extra aide in the mobile classroom. Generally parents were not encouraged to participate in the group sessions because of lack of space.

What are the advantages of a mobile unit?

Project directors, teachers, and home visitors commented on the identity and visibility which the mobile unit gave to the program. They also mentioned that the brief parent/staff contacts as parents brought and picked up the children were without the inhibiting influence of a school building. Teachers were able to talk with many parents about small problems, to give instructional advice, and to encourage parents in their work with children.

Instructional activity and emphasis did not seem greatly different in mobile vans except that the out-of-doors area was frequently used for physical and game activity, and reading may have been a more frequent indoor activity. As one director commented, "anything too big for the van can't be used and we can't have too many activities going on at one time."

Materials Developed by Parent/Child Programs

Of the 31 parent/child programs 19 have developed and produced (printed or recorded) professional parenting materials including audio cassettes, videotapes, activity cards, checklists, booklets, and handbooks. For two of the programs product development was the prime objective; they were funded to develop specific products, to use them under controlled conditions, and to produce a limited number of copies. At least ten other programs were committed to the development of a product as an outcome or continuance of the activities of their programs. Their funded proposals which developed parenting materials established this kind of production as one of their objectives. The remaining seven programs took advantage of a fortuitous activity or incident and developed a product from it. In most cases, these materials have been duplicated or printed in sufficient quantity for distribution only within the program.

What materials were produced by the two programs especially funded for product development?

The products which were major outcomes of the two programs are unique and of professional interest. One program produced 24 audio cassette tapes, each dealing with a specific topic of parent/child relationships. Accompanying the cassettes are home instruction activity cards (120 in all) which give directions for making inexpensive common household items into instructional materials. Program funds provided for individuals to develop the cassettes and cards, expenses for their field testing and evaluation by parents, and the production of a limited number of sets. The director also wrote a 60-page handbook on child development for training the home visitors who worked with the mothers in trying out the cassettes.

The second product development program produced 200 home activity cards and 32 game activity cards for arithmetic preschool readiness and early grades. These were tested under controlled conditions by a large number of parents with children enrolled in other federally-funded preschool and school projects. Thus, the field test of the materials was conducted through other funds but the appropriate evaluation activities were supported from parent program funds. This program, it should be noted, also produced both parent and child skill profile checklists, a five-booklet series on how children learn, and two other booklets for parents, all related to the major product.

What kinds of materials did the other programs develop?

One program printed and distributed 1800 copies of activity guides for using the Captain Kangaroo television series as the basis of instruction of preschool children. The guides were for parents and teachers of preschool classes and were distributed nationally at cost. Each guide specifies objectives and outcomes for instruction and suggests instructional activities and games. This same parent/child program also produced a staff training manual from several years of experience in training staff of other programs. Several of the 31 parent/child programs in the consortium used the activity guides for their instruction and visited this program for staff training.

Another parent/child program developed an integrated program for school education including a two-year parent curriculum. Among the materials developed over many years are Bingo-type games for parents (an idea which was widely adopted by many programs for their parent workshops), 19 booklets for parents, and many materials for children. The topics of the parent booklets include concept development, pre-reading skills, development of positive self-image, child management, the parent as teacher, and activities to do at home. It should be noted that these materials represent the accumulated experience of one of the earliest programs of parent education in the region.

One parent/child program was designed and instructed by staff and graduate students from a local university. Parent and infant interactions and experiences were recorded on

videotapes which will be edited to show the influence of parent instruction on developing inter-relationships and on enhancing growth in communications and motor skills. The products being refined are a set of parent instructional activities and a curriculum for the child from birth to 3 years, supported by videotapes illustrating child development from birth to 6 months, 6 to 12 months, 12 to 24 months, and 24 to 36 months.

Another program developed 154 folders which contain instructional materials and directions for teaching first and second grade skills in five areas. The outside of the folder identifies the instructional objective, behavior assessment criteria, instructional activities, and additional development activities.

Another program, with the assistance of local college students, developed cards which provide parents with information on and suggestions for using the activities and materials which the program made available through the toy libraries. Each material and activity card also allows for an evaluation of its value by the parent and a record of who has used it. Also, this program provided each parent with a report for their child, showing progress in knowledge of colors, shapes, counting, size, body parts, and social, motor, and language development.

Yet another parent program developed a bibliography of commercial materials available for parent education. More than 70 professional books, dozens of parenting kits and programs, and several hundred games, books, workbooks and ditto formats, and magazines and newspapers were appraised. The publication will include three categories: professional staff materials, parent training materials, and materials for instructing children.

One other program has published 13 booklets, each relating to a single concept; another program has published a booklet describing gross motor games for cognitive, physical, emotional, and social growth.

Did any small-scale development of materials take place?

Other programs also have produced excellent materials to suit their needs. They are:

- audiotapes for parents who do not read
- cookbooks of recipes which are easy for children or which are favorites of the children
- lists of skills along a child development continuum
- booklets and manuals for training professional staff and volunteers
- curriculum for parent education
- evaluation and assessment instruments (parent attitude, program assessment)
- newsletters
- certificates of participation
- brochures and public relations materials

Staffing of Parent/Child Programs

The 31 parent/child programs employed 294 persons, 197 (67%) of them full time, 20 part time, and 77 others (including 20 parents) who received a relatively small salary supplement. Forty-nine (17%) of those employed were involved in the management of the program, 27 as administrators and 22 as providers of special program services to the administrators. Two hundred and two (75%) were employed primarily for instructional services; these included 117 home visitors and 85 teachers. Twenty-three operated in a non-education job capacity: 19 provided secretarial services, and 4 were aides (including bus drivers).

In addition to the salaried employees, two programs involved high school students who were enrolled in child development classes; one program provided a practicum for university teacher preparation; three others involved college students in a paraprofessional capacity.

About how many staff members did each parent/child program employ?

Although the number of staff in any one program ranged from 1 to 43, the most frequent size was 5, 6, or 7 (over 50% of the programs). At the lower end of the range, two programs had only one staff member, and seven operated with two or three persons. At the upper end, only six programs employed more than 10 staff; they hired 12, 18, 24 (two programs), 34, and 43 persons. Of these highly staffed programs, three were composed of persons who drew relatively small salary supplements, and three were composed of full-timers. The largest, in fact, hired 43 full-time employees, mostly home visitors, all paid from project funds.

Did all parent/child programs have full-time directors?

Twenty-seven programs hired directors; four operated under the supervision of a central office administrator, usually the coordinator of federal programs. Of the 27, 18 had complete management responsibility and were paid in full from program funds. However, three of these also taught their program's preschool classes. Six of the directors were paid from other funding sources but had full responsibility for the parent/child program. Most of these collaborative projects were closely related to parent education activities. The two half-time directors had other assigned duties, either as director of another program or as a curriculum supervisor.

Another way to provide a director for a parent/child program was to supplement the salary of a teacher or supervisor and assign him or her specific management duties. In the one program opting for this pattern, the director provided management services during lunch, planning period, and after-school hours.

What kinds of specialists were hired?

Twelve parent/child programs were assisted by 22 special professionals. Of these, ten were employed full time with project funds; three others were available full-time but paid from other project funds; one nurse was half time with project funds; and eight persons received salary supplements for special services. The majority of these employees participated in program operations as assistant to the director with special responsibilities for one component, such as the parent workshops or home visits. Four others were resource teachers with special liaison responsibility between the classroom teacher and home visitor, and three others were responsible for health emphasis of the curriculum. Four specialists wrote, illustrated, and edited publications.

Did the parent/child programs have secretarial help?

Eighteen programs employed secretarial staff, and one other program had access to and contributed funds to a secretarial pool. A total of 19 persons were employed in secretarial

or clerical capacities—12 full time, 6 half time, and 1 one-third time. All but five were paid from program funds. Interestingly, one program assigned some home visiting activity to a secretary, and in another an aide employed as a home visitor accomplished the secretarial tasks.

A few of the 12 programs which did not employ a secretary had access to these services through the school or district offices, but for the most part each staff member did whatever typing and record-keeping was necessary. Only a few directors thought that a secretary was unnecessary but many expressed quite vocally that more of this service was needed.

On what basis were home visitors employed?

Twenty-four programs employed a total of 117 home visitors; all but 22 of them were paid from program funds. Of the 117 home visitors, 110 worked full time, 5 half time, and 2 received supplemental salary for specific short-term involvement. The largest program employed 32 home visitors and was the only program with more than 8. Half of the programs employed 4 or 5 home visitors, and five programs employed one home visitor. Six of the persons classified as home visitors didn't actually visit homes but met individually with the parent at school or sent materials and directions for instructional activity to the parent via the student.

On what basis were teachers of the preschool classes employed?

The fourteen programs with preschool classes varied greatly in their teacher staffing patterns. One contracted with a university-based program for all of the instruction and parent contact, but the others varied from one to eight teachers, and three also employed classroom aides. Their distribution was as follows:

Number of Programs	Number of Teachers	Number of Aides
1	1	
1	1 (also director)	1 (also visits)
2	2 (also director)	
	2	2 (also visits)
2	4	
1	5	5
1	8	

One additional program which was primarily engaged in product development used preschool and elementary classes operating in 11 schools without identifying their teaching patterns.

Staff Development

All of the 31 parent/child programs expended time and funds for staff development. The activities included: (1) attendance at state, multi-state, and region-wide meetings; (2) weekly and less frequent staff training sessions, primarily planned and presented by the program director or other school staff specialists; (3) intermittent staff training sessions with consultants; (4) visits to exemplary parenting programs; and (5) before-school summer workshops. Three projects were unique: one held six three-day workshops scheduled at intervals during the school year, with consultants for each; the second provided ten hours of before-school training and ten additional hours during the year; and the third contracted with a university-based agency to provide eight training sessions during the year. Interestingly, only about six of the programs were in contact with their states' General Assistance Centers. Primarily, they received advice from them in response to an inquiry, but one program received a week-long nightly workshop for parents.

How important was attendance at professional meetings?

Attendance at meetings was the only professional development activity in which the administrators of all 31 programs and a few other staff participated. Two states held state-wide meetings sponsored by other fund sources but which had parenting activities as part of their programs. All of the program administrators attended these sessions and about half of them took several or all of their instructional staff. The regional project sponsored four bi-state meetings; at Birmingham for Mississippi and Alabama programs; at Jackson for Tennessee and Kentucky programs; at Columbia for South and North Carolina programs; and at Atlanta for Georgia and Florida programs. The administrators of all but one or two programs attended the appropriate area meeting. The regional project also sponsored two region-wide implementation workshops in Atlanta which were attended by all but a few of the program administrators. The major professional conference offered to participating programs was held in Florida in the spring as an opportunity to exchange success experiences. More than 500 persons attended, among them almost every administrator and many of the professional and paraprofessional staff from more than half of the programs. Also, several of the program directors were members of the National Association for the Education of Young Children and attended its national meeting in Dallas.

Although many of the program directors stated that their paraprofessionals should attend professional meetings, prior to the Florida conference only seven or eight programs had provided this opportunity to some of their staff, and only two programs had offered it to all of their staff. In ranking the importance of professional meetings with other staff development activities, program directors placed them solidly in the middle of nine items, showing that attendance at professional meetings was of moderate importance.

Did staff members visit other parent/child programs?

Staff from 11 programs visited other exemplary parent programs; three of them went outside the region to Little Rock, Arkansas, St. Louis, Missouri, and Detroit, Michigan. Within the region, visits for training purposes (which usually included the director and part or all of the paraprofessional staff) were made to the Clinch-Powell Educational Cooperative (five), the Murfreesboro Classroom-on-Wheels (three), Memphis, and Tuscaloosa. Clinch-Powell provided home visitor training and television utilization training (based on "Captain Kangaroo") as a regular part of its dissemination effort, and many more programs and individual staff members than reported here have attended their week-long training program in Knoxville. Similarly, many more program staff in the region have visited Murfreesboro than are reported here.

How much was usually spent for staff travel?

Funds spent for travel to professional meetings and for staff visits to exemplary programs ranged from approximately $200 to more than $3,000. About one quarter of the programs were in the lower range; about one-third were in the range of $600 to $800; and another third of them werre in the $1,000 to $1,200 range. Only three programs exceeded $1,200 travel expenditure for staff professional development.

What about in service training sessions?

Inservice meetings were ranked by program directors as the most important staff development activity. Twenty-one of the thirty-one programs scheduled group work sessions for the staff, usually weekly, and used a portion of each session or selected sessions for staff training. In many cases, these sessions included previewing the commercial parent training materials to be used in a subsequent parent workshop. Several program directors used this preview as pre-training of the staff in the skills needed for the parent workshop and the home visits. Only four programs indicated that they had a structured sequence of training, and in each case, this was based on commercial materials which were equally applicable for use in parent training.

A large proportion of the time spent in staff training was in discussing solutions to the problems which staff encountered. A second common use of this time was in acquiring the skills for constructing and using various instructional toys, games, puzzles, and activities which would later be taught to parents during home visits. These training sessions were conducted by the program director or a specialist on the program staff such as a nurse or resource person. Most frequently, inservice training was done on Friday and lasted about two hours. The remainder of the day was frequently spent doing program chores such as record keeping, writing reports, reading professional materials, and making parent/child materials. (A few programs continued with home visits.)

Seven of the parent/child programs held summer workshops for the staff; four of them were one week long, and two were two weeks (but not all of the time was spent in early childhood or parenting topics), and one program met three weekends. The lengthier workshops all involved other professionals as well as program staff.

In summary it should be noted that those programs offering little inservice training to the instructional staff either had three or fewer members (which would hardly warrant expenditure for consultants) or had staff with many years experience and little turn-over.

What kinds of materials were used in inservice training?

Twelve of the programs purchased professional parent training materials for use in staff training and four other programs wrote and published staff training handbooks. The commercial materials were frequently also used in parent workshops because of their general applicability. Typically the amount of money spent on commercial materials was from $500 to $800 and one program with multiple staff teams spent several thousand dollars.

The training handbooks produced by four programs were especially directed toward the training needs of the staff. Two of them evolved from the uniqueness of the program or of the materials and activities which the programs were developing. The other two were more general but directed toward the duties of home visitors and skills for relating to parents.

Besides the program director, who conducted inservice training?

Almost two-thirds of the programs used school district staff as occasional consultants to train or educate program staff in special areas. These included test specialists, psychologists,

counselors, resource teachers, media and audiovisual staff, and speech and hearing correctionists. Many of these same programs received free training assistance from federal, state, and local community agencies, especially the Extension Division of the Department of Agriculture, health, and social welfare agencies, dental and medical persons, and Children's Television Workshop staff. On several occasions the consultant secured from the community would first orient and train the program staff for follow-up activities and then provide a workshop program for the parents.

Fourteen of the programs employed individual consultants to provide specialized instruction in one area of early childhood development. Most frequently these were university staff and were paid travel expenses and fee. In all but three of these fourteen programs, from two to five consultants were employed, indicating that if the budget included consultants at all, it provided for more than one. Several of the consultants in great demand were directors of several older and well-established participating programs, such as the one in Chattanooga, Tennessee. Their experiences were especially valuable in helping to structure new program operations and in providing advice and training to paraprofessionals. The regional project encouraged the use of experienced staff from programs in the region by expediting contacts among them and by providing consultant travel and fees to participating programs upon request. Sixteen consultant visits were thus sponsored by the regional project.

About half of the program directors scheduled and conducted inservice for their staff but did not include it as a line item in their budget. Such inservice usually took the following formats: (1) discussion of problems encountered on the job, (2) study and discussion based on some of the commercial parenting materials, and (3) workshops based on special knowledges and skills needed for program activity and provided by community or school personnel.

What kinds of cooperative inservice training were tried?

Several programs reported favorable experiences from joining the training activities of other special programs—ESAA, Head Start, and Title I. Several of the arrangements were:

1. The staff of a non-ESAA program joined ESAA staff for basic and general instruction and then met separately to apply the information and training to the tasks of their own parenting program.
2. The school district held a long-term continuing contract with a consultant to provide inservice for ESAA staff eight times each year. This service was expanded to secure special sessions for parent programs.
3. The staff of one program regularly traveled to the regional inservice training sessions operated by Title I for a multi-county area.

What inservice training techniques and procedures were considered most successful?

The following practices were mentioned as being particularly helpful or appropriate to a particular program.

1. Using a university consultant in guidance to train the teachers and aides in human relations, the art of being helpful not directive, and the technique of guiding rather than lecturing.
2. Playing the role of parents and going through commercial parent training programs, including pre- and posttesting, recommended discussions, and suggested exercises; then selecting sections judged to be most potentially useful for a certain parent population.
3. Arranging a weekly staff conference using the school district's centrex communication system into all the schools; scheduling additional weekly individual telephone calls between the program director and each staff member.
4. Spending the first two weeks planning as a team and in training sessions, then orienting the regular school personnel, and recruiting parent participants.

5. Contracting with a university professor to provide 15 three-hour inservice sessions every other Friday afternoon. (This was a pre-planned program with practicum assignments to be done during home visiting activity.)
6. Offering off-campus credit courses in the building used by two parent/child programs. (In one case, a course was offered on Friday afternoon and replaced inservice activity for the staff members who enrolled.)
7. Maintaining a regular staff conference schedule. (One program director met weekly in his office with the paraprofessionals, classroom aides, and home visitors; he met with the preschool classroom teachers in each school monthly to help them work with the new materials being developed; and he held bi-monthly meetings of the ESAA resource teachers and specialists to acquaint them with the phases of training which were coming next.)

Overview of Each Participating Program

The following brief summaries of the 31 parent/child programs participating in the Parent Education Demonstration Project are based on the reports and interpretations of visiting staff and evaluators. Any inaccuracy or possible misrepresentation is unintentional. The summaries are intended to highlight the major components of the projects and their special characteristics.

The summaries are arranged by state and in alphabetical order according to the agencies to which the grants were made. A complete list of addresses and phone numbers of the project directors and central office staff appears as Appendix A.

Birmingham, Alabama

FUNDING	Title III ($40,000)
PROJECT STAFF	Project director 4 home visitors (half-time) Secretary
POPULATION SERVED	20 participants were selected from each neighborhood of 3 public schools and from the patrons of one parochial school. All of them were volunteers and signed an agreement to remain through the program; sixteen of them were working mothers.
NUMBER OF PARENTS	80 mothers, 2 groups of 40 each; and only 3 dropped out
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	80 children, birth to 6 years; an estimated 80 to 90 additional preschool siblings in the home and 80-90 other siblings in the early school grades.
OBJECTIVES	To develop and produce a program of 24 audiotapes in the skill and problem areas of parenting and parent/child communications To improve the communication skills of parents and participating children in the 3 to 5 age group To develop general positive attitudes and parenting skills, in the participating parents To establish individual personal improvement through positive changes in attitudes and in the abilities to function in the prescription problem areas treated by the tapes and components
STRATEGIES OF DELIVERY	Each participant was loaned a non-recording tape player and provided with the toys, games, and materials for the activities suggested on the tapes.

A regularly employed elementary school counselor in each of the schools participated half-time with the project, making approximately weekly, hour-long home visits to each participant or making contact with the working mothers as pre-arranged. In most cases, the working mothers came by the school; a few were fleetingly contacted by the counselor enroute to or at work; and occasionally, mail was the chief means of exchanging any materials.

PROCEDURES

A school system survey of 116 mothers identified 40 topics of parenting and family problems in which they desired instruction or help.

The 40 topics of the survey were organized into 24 audio-tape programs; scripts were prepared by specialists in the field and the project director; all were edited by the project director and produced with competent artists and actors.

A sequence of 6 to 8 tapes was prescribed for each participating parent, based on an initial interview and data from the *Peabody Picture Test* and *Parent Problem Inventory*. Home visitors then exchanged tapes and materials at one- week to ten-day intervals.

During each visit the home visitor secured an evaluation of the tape and its effectiveness and introduced the new tape and materials. These visits concerned evaluating the quality of the tape rather than providing supplemental instruction. The program for each parent was concluded by re-administration of the initial interview and test instruments.

EVALUATION

Parents and their preschoolers responded to the *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test* at the beginning and end of their involvement. Mothers also responded to a locally-developed *Parent Isolation of Problems Inventory* to help counselors (home visitors) prescribe appropriate audio tapes. At the conclusion of the project, mothers also completed a brief questionnaire of seven items relating to the project. Also, classroom teachers administered the *Devereux Elementary School Rating Scale* to schoolage siblings.

Greene County, Alabama

FUNDING	Title I ($38,886)
PROJECT STAFF	Project director (not paid from Title I funds) Parent facilitator (not paid from Title I funds) 4 Home visitors Secretarial services
POPULATION SERVED	Participation was solicited from among the parents of 132 children enrolled in the county day care program which maintained activities at a preschool center in Eutaw.
NUMBER OF PARENTS	40 parents; each home visitor is responsible for maintaining a minimum case load of 10 families
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	40 three- and four-year-old children; additional younger siblings in the home, and additional older siblings enrolled in Head Start and early school grades
OBJECTIVES	To train parents in child growth and development roles and improve the home learning environment To establish parent and family participation in those health, welfare, and educational public services which would enhance the learning process To provide motivational sessions and activities to improve parent self-esteem
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Project administration and supervision were provided by two staff members whose principal duties were with the Head Start and Day Care program. Weekly home visits from one to two hours in length on a constant schedule Intermittent transportation services to individual parents and parent groups to secure health and family services and for project activities Seven monthly parent training workshops at the preschool center Seven monthly parent activity days (usually Saturday) for field trips, toy and game making, ceramic instruction, etc. One day per month parent voluntary classroom service days (These volunteers may ride the Head Start bus on the day they provide volunteer service.) Two lightly stocked toy lending libraries, one in the day preschool center and the other in a cooperating school on the other side of the county which also serves as headquarters for two of the home visitors
PROCEDURES	Home visitors were trained in a two-week summer workshop and received additional inservice training one day per month. Home visitors operated county-wide and provided home instruction to implement the parenting concepts or public services covered in the monthly parent training workshops. They also exchanged toy library materials and helped the parent to make toys and games for instruction of all the young children in the family. In addition, the home visitor transported the parent and children and assisted them to secure public services which would alleviate problems in their learning environment.

	The project director and supervisor planned and presented seven parent workshops on topics such as child growth and development, concept development, nutrition, health, and community services and agencies. Also they planned and assisted the home visitors to provide field trips and group activity sessions to promote social and emotional development. Additionally, each parent was requested to volunteer to work one day per month as an aide in the day care classroom, working with their own children and with other children.
EVALUATION	Before and after involvement, parents responded to the *High/Scope Home Environment Scale* and a *Home Environment Review*. The *Denver Developmental Screening Test* and a *Preschool Inventory* were administered pre and post to preschoolers. In addition, data were collected for formative evaluation: feedback from parents on the workshops and their involvement in the program, and home visit records.

Huntsville, Alabama

FUNDING	ESAA/Basic component ($22,000)
PROJECT STAFF	Parent component coordinator Aide/Secretary
POPULATION SERVED	Parents of students in ESAA classes in 17 elementary schools were eligible. Each was invited to participate through an invitation sent home with the student. Late in the project year, a telephone invitation effort was added through the incentive of an ex-teacher volunteer.
NUMBER OF PARENTS	Approximately 300 out of 2,100 parents not already involved in other parent project activities participated in one or more of the 2 workshops presented at each of 17 elementary schools. Approximately 40 of the participants also accepted volunteer training and served in the ESAA remedial classrooms of their local school.
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	Services of the parent component were provided to the parents of ESAA children and did not establish direct contact with preschool children or with the students enrolled in the ESAA program.
OBJECTIVES	To train parents to guide the education of their children To establish individual parent personal improvements by educating them to services which stimulate self-help effort, develop a positive self-image, and increase social and educational involvement
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Two parent training workshops presented at each of the 17 elementary schools Home visits made by project staff only when required because of a problem situation Encouragement and training of parents who volunteer to serve as an aide in the ESAA classroom

PROCEDURES	The Parent Component coordinator and aide planned a program of three parent workshops, covering topics such as child growth and development, discipline and motor skill development. Two of them were offered, in turn, at all of the 17 schools.
	Two booklets, one on the topic of self-concept and the other describing instructional activities for parent use, were written by the staff and distributed to many of the participating parents.
EVALUATION	Workshops for parents were evaluated by staff observation.

Mobile, Alabama

FUNDING	ESAA/Pilot component ($50,000)
PROJECT STAFF	Project supervisor (Resource teacher from ESAA/Basic) 1 Home visitor Secretary
POPULATION SERVED	Parents of children in ESAA classrooms of one elementary school who elect to participate
NUMBER OF PARENTS	About 140 parents have participated in at least one of the three ESAA district-wide workshops. About 40 parents have participated in the five individual school workshops and approximately 10 of these parents have provided volunteer services to non-academic school activities.
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	Except for day care services during workshops in the individual schools, the parent component does not provide direct services to children.
OBJECTIVES	To train parents in the principles of developing positive parent/child relationships
	To educate parents in the objectives and services of the local school program
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	3 workshops for the parents of all ESAA children, grades 1 through 12, provided by contract with a university-based agency
	5 workshops offered by project for the parents of its ESAA children
	4 joint parent/child non-academic activities
	Provision of child care during project activities

	One aide of the ESAA team worked primarily in parent activities, did home visiting, and provided transportation as necessary.
	Toy library located in the ESAA center
PROCEDURES	ESAA staff and the principal at the school had initial responsibility for interesting parents in the program of the school; $400 was allocated for the year to support activities such as field trips, banquets, films, refreshments, etc. to initiate and build parent involvement.
	ESAA provided three system-wide night workshops in Donnelly Field facilities on the role of the parents: (1) in early childhood education, (2) in school goals and objectives, and (3) in the education process.
	After the second system-wide workshop, the project school provided its own series of day time workshops to explain and get parents involved in the school program. Also they received training and practice in the specific skills for supplementing school instruction and making toys and games to use in instructional activities with their children at home. An ESAA staff member planned and arranged for each workshop; the parent supervisor (or resource teacher) presented the program; ESAA aides provided day care for the preschool children.
	Workshop groups selected field trips, films, banquets, activity days, and used commercial parenting kit materials for additional activity designed to motivate continued parent participation in the workshops; three such events were provided.
	The parent aide scheduled an average of twenty home visits per week to alleviate parent/student school problem relationships, not necessarily for parent instruction.
SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS	ESAA/Basic and ESAA/Pilot projects supplemented each other and correlated so well that it is difficult to separate their activities. Successful practices for one were quickly implemented by the other.
	The contract arrangements which provided for full-package delivery of three major workshops and for full evaluation of the ESAA programs has resulted in a superior product in each case, which allowed project personnel to concentrate on the individual school parent training activity.
EVALUATION	Part of the contract for evaluating the total ESAA program; detailed information is not available.

Montgomery, Alabama

FUNDING	ESAA/Pilot component ($27,840)
PROJECT STAFF	Project director Community/school resource coordinator 3 principals (work overload and supplementary pay) 10 ESAA teachers (work overload and supplementary pay) 11 ESAA aides (work overload and supplementary pay) 3 janitors and driver (work overload and supplementary pay)
POPULATION SERVED	Parents of children enrolled in grades one and two at three elementary schools with ESAA classroom programs
NUMBER OF PARENTS	124 parents have participated in at least one parent workshop; 60 parents have maintained consistent attendance
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	55 first- and second-grade children enrolled in ESAA classrooms and 115 preschool siblings
OBJECTIVES	To train parents to supplement at home school instruction which uses the "Learning Based Reading Program" materials To educate parents in the principles of child growth and development and positive parenting practices
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	15 parent workshops at each of three schools including complementary child training sessions Toy lending library at each school
PROCEDURES	Workshops were held Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday nights, two weeks per month at each school. Project staff and consultants provided the program for parents based on topics and materials from several commercial parent training programs. Instructional activities for the children were provided by ESAA teachers and aides. The activities provided for the children were selected so as to initiate home learning activities which were to be continued by the parents and were supplemental to the newly adopted, experienced based reading program. The same experiences were provided on successive nights at each school.
SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS	The community/school resource coordinator was the only full time project employee. Principals, janitors, driver, and ESAA teachers and aides participated in project activities and received supplemental salary payments.
EVALUATION	Formative evaluation consisted of parents' feedback on workshops, their responses to rating scales, staff observations, attendance records, library check-out records, and so on.

Montgomery, Alabama

FUNDING	ESAA/Basic component ($27,500)
PROJECT STAFF	Parent component coordinator 10 ESAA teachers (work overload and supplemental pay) 12 ESAA aides (work overload and supplemental pay) Secretary (1/3 time)
POPULATION SERVED	Parents of children in ESAA classes at two elementary schools who had additional preschool aged children and elected to participate
NUMBER OF PARENTS	110 parents have participated; 35 have maintained consistent attendance.
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	135 preschool-aged children have accompanied their parents to to the workshops; an additional 25 school-aged children have also participated.
OBJECTIVES	To educate the parents in the principles of child growth and development To teach parents skills for helping their children gain school readiness in language proficiency, motor skills, and self-image.
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	11 Saturday workshops at each school and complementary child training sessions for preschool children Toy lending library at each school
PROCEDURES	Workshops were held two Saturdays each month beginning at 9:00 a.m. at the public school and 1:00 p.m. at the parochial school. Project staff and consultants provided the same program to the parents at each school; an ESSA teacher in each school supervised the children's activities; and one-half of the ESAA teachers and aides in each school alternately, worked with the children at each session. Program planning was done by six-staff committees which met prior to each workshop. Parents and children were separated upon arrival for their separate activities. The parent schedule usually included a program of parenting information on specific topics, observation of teachers instructing the children, making instructional toys and games, and joint parent/child educational sessions. Toys and games were returned and new selections loaned from the toy library at the end of each session.
SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS	Teacher/aide/child activities during several of the workshops were videotaped and used with parents during their instructional sessions. The parent education coordinator was the only full time staff person for parenting; all other services were performed by ESAA teachers and aides as overload to their ESAA responsibilities.
EVALUATION	Children were administered the *Test of Basic Experiences* at the beginning and end of year. Parents responded to a *Community Attitude Inventory*, a brief locally-developed pretest on child development, and a questionnaire about the program.

Alachua County, Florida

FUNDING	Title III ($35,746)
PROJECT STAFF	Project director (not paid from project funds) Project aide
POPULATION SERVED	Parents and their 6 month to 36 month old children living in low income environments; half in housing developments, 30% from the school neighborhood, and 20% from around the city.
NUMBER OF PARENTS	40 parents: 10 with children from 0-6 months in age; 10 with children 6 to 12 months old; 10 with children 12 to 24 months in age; 10 with children from 24 to 36 months in age
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	40 children, 10 in each age group: 0-6 months, 6-12 months, 12-24 months, and 24-36 months
OBJECTIVES	To educate parents in family development and parenting skills such as using household items as educational toys, using children's TV programs, decision making, communicating, and developing a positive self-image in the child
	To develop a curriculum for parenting and family development with children up to three years old using the school as a resource
	To train parents to be effective teachers of children from their birth
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Parent/child two- to three-hour class sessions one day each week; all subject to videotaping
	Monthly parent workshops and five Saturday parent workshops to allow fathers to attend
	Toy lending library
	Home visits to high anxiety parents as needed but less than monthly to the typical family
	Transportation to individual participants when requested and essential
PROCEDURES	The project received administrative supervision from the director of Project Circle and employed only one aide who provided liaison and assistance as needed to the parent participants, professional staff, and administration as needed.
	Classroom activities, parent conferences and workshops, toy library operation, and curriculum connected home visiting were provided by the contract agent.
	Classroom sessions were held for one age group each Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday mornings. Instructional emphasis fostered the sequential development of the family relationship and communication pattern. This was recorded on videotape and in written curricula. These videotapes were used for parent instruction in the workshops.
	Workshops for instructing parents only were held monthly; these supplemented the classroom sessions in which the children and parents operated in a partnership association. The topics educated parents in the various aspects of child growth, discipline, self-image, etc.

A monthly Saturday workshop for making instructional toys and games was held to get the fathers involved. About half of the fathers attended.

All of the classes and workshops were held in the project center located in an elementary school. The toy library was a part of the center so the parents had access to these items during class sessions and checked items out for loan at any time.

SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS

This project completed the life education coverage for citizens of the county school district from birth through adult programs: this project 0-3 years; Project Circle, 3 and 4 years; Head Start, 5 years; and K through 12, and adult, and vocational.

The total educational program for parents and children was contracted to a university-based private agency. Two professors, several graduate students, a nurse, and audiovisual specialists were almost constantly involved.

A publication, *Curriculum from Birth to 36 Months*, has been completed and the video tape has been edited to show the pattern of developing family relationships during each of the four age spans.

EVALUATION

Parents responded to several instruments at the beginning and end of the year: the *Home Environment Review*, *How I See Myself Scale*, and the *Rosensveig P.F. Study*. Ongoing evaluation was made through a review of videotapes of mothers and infants, home visitor reports, and mothers' feedback on class sessions.

Broward County, Florida

FUNDING	Title III ($32,954)
PROJECT STAFF	Project director Secretary (half-time) 4 ESAA aides (assigned to perform project duties)
POPULATION SERVED	Parents of three- and four-year-old children who lived in the neighborhoods of the four participating schools and who elected to participate
NUMBER OF PARENTS	76 parents; an ESSA aide at each school was responsible for maintaining 20 parents in active participation.
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	Services were not provided to the children except for day care services during the periods of the parent workshops.
OBJECTIVES	To establish favorable and positive attitudes in parents toward themselves, their children, and the school To educate parents in parenting and child management skills and increase the amount of time spent in educative activities
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Five bi-monthly parent workshops Telephone and home visit contacts by ESAA aides promoting and supplementing the workshops Toy library at each school
PROCEDURES	The project director planned and presented five parent workshop programs at each of four schools using consultants from community and state agency resources for three of them. Handouts and booklets were prepared and distributed at each one. Also, toys and games were constructed by every parent during the work activity period. Child care services and refreshments were provided for any children brought by the parents. The ESAA aides made telephone contact with each parent to encourage attendance and visited the homes once or twice between workshops to keep each parent active. The aides also picked up and delivered additional supplementary toy lending library items so as to encourage additional parent/child activity.
SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS	The project director provided extensive training for the ESAA aides through 7 group training sessions, 9 individual conferences concerned with training information and activities, and from 30 to 40 telephone contacts to discuss individual problems and problem solutions for their parent participants. It has been determined that continued parent participation was in relationship to the frequency of contact. The project has produced a large number of handouts for the parent workshops and for training the ESAA aides; also two major booklets, "Kindergarten Gourmet" and "Five Year Child Growth and Development Chart." The items purchased for the toy library were especially selected so as not to preempt the kindergarten program of instruction.
EVALUATION	Formative evaluation was based on attendance records for parent meetings, staff observation, and home visit reports by community aides. At the end of the year parents responded to a structured interview and to a questionnaire, both administered by community aides.

Clarke County, Georgia

FUNDING	ESAA/Basic component ($14,742)
PROJECT STAFF	Project director (½ time) 4 Kindergarten teachers (work overload and supplemental pay) 1 Home/school coordinator (work overload and supplemental pay)
NUMBER OF PARENTS	About 110 parents attended one or more meetings
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	110 five-year-olds and additional younger children in some homes
POPULATION SERVED	Participation was voluntary and resulted from an invitation carried home by the 275 children enrolled in a special experimental kindergarten program in three elementary schools. All participants would be eligible ESAA participant families.
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Five parent training workshops
OBJECTIVES	To teach parents the skills for relating to and communicating with their children To teach parents skills for helping their children to gain school readiness
PROCEDURES	Initial project activities involved parents of children enrolled in ESAA classes who also had preschool children at home. The activities included 8 summer training workshops for the parents, with 8 more workshops planned during the school year. Low participation caused a change in operation to involve only parents enrolled in a kindergarten program from the same ESAA population but in only three schools. The new activities provided five parent workshops organized with the help of a university consultant and presented by the project director and one of the four kindergarten teachers. The topics were scheduled through a needs survey and included spending time wisely with children, preschool reading skills, preschool arithmetic skills, developing self-discipline, and using the community for learning experiences. Children who accompanied their parents received child care services during the workshops. The home/school coordinator made contact with parents or visited at home on a special need or problem basis.
EVALUATION	Each workshop was evaluated by the participants. Parent participants responded to locally-developed questionnaires to record their attitude and behavior changes, and their communication and relationship activities with their children.

Dooly County, Georgia

FUNDING	Title III ($49,047)
PROJECT STAFF	Project director Secretary/aide
NUMBER OF PARENTS	About 120 have participated, with about 60 continuing through to completion.
NUMBER AND AGE CHILDREN	120 four- and five-year-olds and younger children in some homes
POPULATION SERVED	Participation was voluntary from among the parents of 125 children enrolled in the Outreach preschool project which had classes at Vienna, Unadilla, and Byromville centers.
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Ten parent training workshops at each of three centers Monthly one-half hour visits to each home Toy lending library located at Vienna Preschool Center
OBJECTIVES	To teach parents to provide home experience to their children which will improve the developmental level of their children To give parents an understanding of child development and of the educational program of Dooly County
PROCEDURES	The project consultant from South Georgia College held a preschool orientation session for parent project and Project Outreach staff including the parent committee. Ten parent training workshops, one each month, were offered at each of the three centers. These were planned and presented by the consultant with assistance of the project director and one Project Outreach teacher assigned to each workshop. The workshops were followed by a monthly visit to each home from the project director or secretary/aide. The major purposes of the home visits were (1) to exchange toy lending library items and (2) to give additional help and instruction to the parent for making and using other common items in the developmental activities presented at the previous workshop. Additionally, the parents were requested to visit the Project Outreach classrooms to observe the teacher in action, to work with their children under supervision, and to exchange toy library items and materials. A few parents did this, and the consultant videotaped 16 to 18 parents in the instructional process, reviewing their instructional behavior with them on playback.
SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS	Transportation to project activities, when needed and requested, was provided with a project-owned station wagon.
EVALUATION	Children's progress is measured in Project Outreach with the *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test*. Toy library use is documented by check-out records. Parent participants respond to a locally-developed instrument to show child development, knowledge acquisition, and attitude change they also respond to the *Porter Parental Acceptance Scale* at the beginning and end of the year. Parents intermittently assessed the workshops they attended.

Muscogee County, Georgia

FUNDING	Title III ($60,281)
PROJECT STAFF	Project Director 5 Home Visitors Nurse (½ time) Secretary
NUMBER OF PARENTS	75 were enrolled by February; about 10 later left.
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	75 four year olds enrolled in Title I project and 90 additional younger siblings in the home
POPULATION SERVED	Participation was voluntary from among the parents who had children enrolled in the Title I preschool project at Harrison Preschool Center and who were educationally disadvantaged. These Title I children were four years old and came from ten target area schools in inner city locations. Often younger children accompanied mothers to the Title III center.
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Bi-weekly parent training workshops (15) were offered for one-half of the parents and repeated the following week for the other half. Workshops were held at the Title III center, part of an elementary school. Home visits, usually hour long, were made weekly to each mother. Also, transportation was given to secure health care services. A toy lending library, materials storage, and project facilities were housed at the Harrison Preschool Center.
OBJECTIVES	To teach parents to provide educational experiences at home to supplement Title I preschool instruction To identify health needs of the children and initiate parent action to secure the services needed To publish a parent handbook covering the curriculum areas offered in the workshops To publish a staff training handbook for inservice use with home visitors, aides, and preschool teachers
PROCEDURES	Two-hour bi-weekly workshops were held for one half of the parents, and each workshop was repeated the following week for the others. All mothers assigned to certain home visitors met at the same time. These workshops were held at the center so parents could observe the Title I teacher and occasionally work with their children in the classroom. Child care services were provided for their younger children and a one-way mirror arrangement allowed parents to observe the home visitors working with the young children. Parents could also eat lunch with the children as a part of the instructional program. The program content emphasized nutrition, health, safety, play, preschool skills, visits to city resources (such as library, clinics, bakery, newspaper, and dairy) and information from resource persons from government, health and welfare agencies, and city, county, and school services. Home visitors made weekly one-hour visits to each mother to exchange items from the toy library and to help mothers make and use games and materials appropriate to the assigned activity.

	Parents also made learning materials at the workshops and could at any time return to check items out of the toy library.
	Friday mornings were scheduled for staff to plan workshops and group activities and to receive inservice training. Home visiting was scheduled for the afternoon.
	The project director and a consultant from Columbus College wrote a curriculum handbook for parents; and the project director and curriculum supervisor for the school district collaborated on a staff handbook for inservice training of home visitors.
EVALUATION	A locally-developed questionnaire was completed by parents at the beginning and end of the project. Parents also wrote pre- and post-narratives. Formative evaluation consisted of (1) staff review of home visit records, (2) parent assessment of workshops, and (3) records of parent conferences.
	The school system's testing specialist also developed forms for measuring parents' improvement in knowing about and using community health services and school services and programs.

Richmond County, Georgia

FUNDING	ESAA/Basic component ($28,192)
PROJECT STAFF	Project Director 4 Home Visitors
NUMBER OF PARENTS	63 families remain after reduction from 5 to 4 home visitors
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	67 three-, four-, and five-year-olds, and additional younger children in some homes
POPULATION SERVED	Parents of children in ESAA classes who had three-, four-, and five-year-old siblings at home and who volunteered to participate
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Five parent training workshops and four field trips to community resources for parents and children
	Weekly home visits, usually one hour in length on a constant schedule
OBJECTIVES	To teach the parents to work in educational activities with their children at home and to gain the skills of managing their children's behavior
	To acquaint parents with community health and welfare services for seeking solutions to family problems.
PROCEDURES	The project was initiated with 15 training sessions on successive Fridays for the home visitors by a university consultant. These Friday sessions proved so valuable that they continued through the year as staff workdays.
	Home visitors each operated throughout the county but concentrated in one area daily. Their weekly schedule was constant, and they checked in and out of the office for each visit or group of visits. Each home visitor spent time helping her families solve personal and family problems through community and school resources.

Emphasis of the home visitors was to function as a consultant and teacher to the parent as the parent taught the child. They also provided transportation to project-related activities and services.

Although not provided for in the proposal, five parent training workshops, and four field trips were arranged for the parents and children. Payne College students provided child care services at each.

A small toy lending library exists but the project does not use or advocate commercial toys and games because of the incentive it would be for parents to purchase. Also, the office facilities are not adequate for housing a large library. Some books and puzzles are distributed by the home visitor from stock which she carries in her car, but most of the instructional materials are made by each home visitor.

One of the staff training sessions on physical movement led to the development and publication of a handbook: *Games for Growth: Cognitive, Physical, Emotional, Social.*

SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS

The ESAA project of which this parent program is a part operates at the secondary level. Hence the average age of the parents having children at both the high school *and* preschool levels was higher than for most other participating parent programs.

EVALUATION

Pre and post tests for children and parents were developed locally with help of a university consultant. The readiness test was administered by home visitors to children in fall and spring. Parents responded to a questionnaire and a survey instrument.

Owensboro, Kentucky

FUNDING	Title III $(40,696)
PROJECT STAFF	Project director (work overload and supplementary salary) 2 Teachers (local city-school support) 2 Teachers (project paid) 3 Classroom aides 1 Classroom aide (parttime)
POPULATION SERVED	Parents of three- to five-year-old children not served by the five parent programs of other projects, who volunteered and were selected from the Louisville City, Davies County, and Catholic Independent school districts. Income was not a criterion. Also, all agreed to participate in classroom activities at least one day per week.
NUMBER OF PARENTS	150 parents in 5 classrooms; project support of 80 parents; about equally divided between the city and county school districts. Fifteen of them were nominated for participation by the Catholic School administration.
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	85 project supported children three, four and five years of age; and day care services to younger children who accompanied their parents on the two days this service was available
OBJECTIVES	To education parents in the knowledges of parenting and child growth and development patterns To provide an environment wherein high school students can learn the principles of child care and parenting
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Three-hour class sessions for children two days each week Parent participation in the classroom one day each week Weekly parent workshop period Day care services one of the days scheduled for each class Monthly (10) parent training sessions Toy library previously stocked with items made by the staff High school students enrolled in Exploring Childhood classes serving practicum
PROCEDURES	The parents were responsible for delivering their children to the center as scheduled two days each week and to remain for participation one of those days. Classes were from 9:00 to 12:00 a.m. and did not include lunch, which the director said would have provided a very desirable instructional area. The final hour of one class session was a parent workshop to make instructional items and discuss parenting problems. Child care services were provided one day for each class so that parents with younger children could schedule it for their class participation. Parent training sessions were scheduled one night per month. The staff and consultants presented programs using commercial parenting kits and materials and local medical personnel. Discussion was the technique emphasized.

SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS	The high school students served only during the semester of their enrollment but they participated in all activities during their tenure including classroom, parent workshops, parent training sessions, staff work sessions, and staff training sessions. The project staff completed and published a series of 13 booklets on the specific topics of parenting.
EVALUATION	Children were administered the *Caldwell Preschool Inventory*, and the *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test*. High school students involved in the preschool program responded to an instrument provided by the Kentucky Department of Education. Records kept on parent participation were also used for assessment.

Columbia, Mississippi

FUNDING	ESAA/Basic component ($1,500)
PROJECT STAFF	Parent/school coordinator (work overload and supplemental salary)
POPULATION SERVED	Parents of children in the ESAA program who had five-year-old siblings at home and who had volunteered to visit the coordinator after school hours one day per month.
NUMBER OF PARENTS	15 of the 75 eligible ESAA parents were enrolled by Thanksgiving; only one dropped out.
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	15 five-year-olds; and additional siblings in a few of the homes but instruction to the children was not a part of the parent component
OBJECTIVES	To train parents in the skills of developing the capabilities needed by their children when entering first grade
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Scheduled monthly visits of each parent, accompanied by the child, to work with the project staff member at school Participation in special system-wide parent day programs four times per year
PROCEDURES	The first-grade teachers and project staff developed a diagnostic checklist of skills they wanted each child to have upon entering first grade. Project staff evaluated each child and provided a packet of materials and instructional activities to provide for sequential continuing skill development. As progress was made the parent returned to school for additional training, instruction, and materials. The child was tested at this time to verify mastery. Project staff and consultants provided special parenting programs for project participants on the four days when all parents were invited to visit in their schools.

SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS	A local community action agency provided six parent meetings providing practicum for graduate students in guidance from a nearby university. Project staff and parents participated.
EVALUATION	A locally-developed diagnostic checklist was used with the children before and after program involvement. The *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test* and a *Photo-Articulation Test* were also used. Parents responded early in the program to a needs assessment.

Jackson, Mississippi

FUNDING	ESAA/Pilot component ($107,160)
PROJECT STAFF	Project facilitator 5 Home visitor/teacher aides 20 parents (parttime home/school coordinators) 1 Aide/secretary
POPULATION SERVED	Parents of children enrolled in ESAA remedial classes in 2 public elementary schools and 2 parochial schools
NUMBER OF PARENTS	170 parents
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	170 students of elementary age
OBJECTIVES	To improve the self-concept of students and parents through parental involvement in supplementing remedial instruction of their children To train parents in the skills of parenting and in providing home instruction in reading and arithmetic To develop and publish a bibliography of commercial materials for use in professional training of staff and parents, and for home instruction of the students
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Twice monthly parent workshops Twice monthly home visits Toy and instructional materials lending library Parent classroom tutor/instructional aides Parent employment as tutor/instructional aide in the classroom and for occasional home visiting

PROCEDURES

Home visitors worked in the classrooms 2½ days each week. As the teacher saw a need for remedial instruction, the aide was told the deficiency and made or selected materials which would alleviate it. These were delivered to the parent for use with the student either at home or during school duty.

Visiting by home visitors was done after 2:00 p.m. Monday and Tuesday and half-day Wednesday when students would likely be available during the visit. Their purpose was to motivate parent instructional activity and deliver new materials, and attendance at parent workshops, not to instruct parents or students.

Parent coordinators were selected by the principals and teachers to work as tutors of their own and other children in the classroom. They received $6 per hour salary, and their involvement was structured to enhance self-concept.

Twice monthly parent study sessions were held at the centrally located community center. Each was presented twice, once at night for working parents and again the next morning for mothers at home. The night sessions had the greater attendance. The topics and presentations usually were selected from and used commercial parenting materials and programs.

SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS

The project purchased an extensive amount of materials in three categories: professional staff literature, parent training materials, and instructional toys, games, books, and other items for home instruction. A bibliography of these has been published.

The project approach offered parents a number of options for participation and maintained contact until one from among these was selected:

work with child at home
work with child in class
come to school and tutor
attend parent workshops
invite aide to the home for initiating instruction

EVALUATION

Children in ESAA classes were tested with the *California Achievement* Test and the *Piers-Harris Children Self-Concept Scale* before and after program involvement. An attitudinal survey was administered to parents. Formative evaluation included records of home visits, parent conferences, parent sessions, and library checkouts.

Jackson, Mississippi

FUNDING	Title III ($27,563)
PROJECT STAFF	Project facilitator 1 Home visitor/instructional aide
POPULATION SERVED	Parents of five-year-old children in the area of one school who volunteered to participate and to enroll their children in a preschool class
NUMBER OF PARENTS	25 parents were enrolled by January
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	25 five-year-olds
OBJECTIVES	To provide developmental pre-first grade experiences to 25 five-year-old children To educate parents in the skills of parenting and to train them to supplement the classroom instruction of their children
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Three hour classroom sessions three days per week Twice monthly parent training workshops and study sessions Monthly home visits by project staff
PROCEDURES	Children attended class Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday mornings for instruction by project facilitator and aide. The curriculum was organized around a sequential list of preschool skills developed by the staff. Each parent was provided with Far West Education Laboratory Toy Kit. Two parent training sessions were provided each month by project staff. Parents were paid $6 per hour as reimbursement for baby sitting and travel expense. First grade teachers also participated and were paid a $6 work overload salary supplement. Parent training sessions were coordinated with classroom instruction so that parents would reinforce the learning progress of their children. The aide made monthly home visits in the afternoons to help parents make and use the instructional toys and activities which would supplement the classroom instruction.
SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS	The parent training session was based primarily on materials selected and adapted from the Olympus system.
EVALUATION	Children responded before and after to the *Minnesota Preschool Scale*, to *Animal Crackers*, and to tests from the *System for Teacher Evaluation of Pre-Readings Skills*. The *Vineland Scale of Social Maturity* was given in February. Parents responded to an attitudinal survey and to questions about each training session.

Edenton-Chowan Counties, North Carolina

FUNDING	ESAA/Pilot component ($29,147)
PROJECT STAFF	School-community coordinator 5 Reading aides
POPULATION SERVED	Parents of ESAA students, Kindergarten through third grade who scored below the 50th percentile in reading and language, and who elected to participate.
NUMBER OF PARENTS	Approximately 60 parents have participated in either the center-based weekly work sessions or the seven project-wide staff and parent training workshops.
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	75 (kindergarten through third grade) but parent involvement was a criteria for this student participation.
OBJECTIVES	To provide additional academic instruction to selected kindergarten through third grade students To educate parents in the knowledge of parenting and the skills for supplementing school remedial instruction at home
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Remedial and parent instruction centers at two schools: one to serve Chowan County population; one to serve Edenton City population. Five reading aides housed in these centers Parent/staff training workshops provided by contract
PROCEDURES	Reading aides provide extra remedial instruction to the selected students at each center four days per week. Parents provided voluntary assistance. They also visited the centers to make or loan directions for using them so as to provide additional remedial instruction at home. The home-school coordinator planned and provided three home parent work sessions each Friday. The parents made instructional toys and games and were shown activities to use in remedial instruction at home. A University of North Carolina based agency provided 7 training sessions for parents and staff in the skills of teaching reading, math, health, music, language, motor skills and social skills.
SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS	A migrant project provided the parent project participants with transportation to the centers when needed, this aide also provided child care services during the workshops, helped keep the centers clean and helped the project aide make instructional games and toys. These services were at no cost to the parent project.
EVALUATION	Parents responded to a survey about the parent meetings and to a questionnaire for assessing children's needs.

Charleston County, South Carolina

FUNDING	ESAA/Basic component ($31,500)
STAFF	Project director (not paid from project funds) 3 Resource specialists 3 Home visitors 1 Secretary (not paid from project funds)
POPULATION SERVED	Parents of selected first- and second-grade children in fifteen elementary schools who scored lowest on the California Test Battery and were behind in their school work
NUMBER OF PARENTS	240 who agreed to accept project services
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	240 first and second grade children and additional younger siblings at home. The parent component did not provide direct instruction to children.
OBJECTIVES	To provide parents with materials and skills for providing remedial instruction to their child To educate parents in the skills of parenting and knowledge of of available school services To develop a permanent parent involvement program in each school and system-wide To develop remedial instruction packages in the five major areas of the curriculum
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Monthly home visits 154 remedial activity folders Monthly parent training workshops at 9 locations within the district Parent committees in each school and a central parent committee for the district Appointment of a contact teacher in each school for liaison with the area resource specialist
PROCEDURES	The 109 ESAA teachers in 15 elementary schools identified the academic deficiency of a student needing remediation and reported it to the contact teacher. This teacher communicated it to the area resource specialist who advised the home visitor. The home visitor accumulated or made any instructional materials needed, selected the proper remedial activity package (folder) and delivered it to the parent at home with adequate instructions for its use. Each resource specialist worked with the contact teacher in five schools and planned and presented monthly parent workshops for her total of 80 parents at 3 community locations within her school areas. Additional parent training sessions were held in each school to orient parents to the school program and classroom materials, to make instructional games and toys, communication skills, and to encourage volunteer services.
SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS	The special 154 remedial activity folders were critical to the program operations. Each listed the instructional objectives, behavior assessment, activity for basic instruction, and additional developmental activities. Instructional materials and directions for their use were inside or accompanied each folder.

EVALUATION	Parents evaluated each parent training session. Volunteers for work in the classroom also attended and evaluated special training sessions. Participation was measured by attendance records, and volunteer-work records.

Columbia, South Carolina

FUNDING	ESAA/Basic component ($40,540)
PROJECT STAFF	One parent component coordinator Two home visitors
POPULATION SERVED	Parents of children enrolled in ESAA classes at all of the elementary schools in the district who had younger siblings at home and who elected to participate at the project locations. One group was previously from a rural area and met in the community center; the other was primarily urban and met in a centrally located elementary school.
NUMBER OF PARENTS	70 families; about 50 consistently attended work sessions and 20 served primarily by home visits.
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	All of the children of preschool age (0-4) in the 70 families; but the project did not provide for instructional contact with the children or child care services during the workshops.
OBJECTIVES	To provide learning experiences for parents or parent substitutes of ESAA students through parent workshops and home visits
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Parent workshops held twice monthly in each of two geographical areas Home visits made twice monthly and lasting 15 or 20 minutes
PROCEDURES	Parents were invited to attend two workshops each month conducted Tuesday evenings by the component coordinator, assisted by the home visitor. Since there are two geographical areas, this means that the coordinator conducted one workshop each week. Many times these were repeated on Wednesday mornings to accommodate parents who could or would not attend at night.

	Home visits were made as follow-up to the workshops. The main function of the home visitors was to deliver materials to mothers and discuss their uses. One visitor was assigned to the rural area, the other to the urban area. Every effort was made to meet the mother on her schedule, even if this meant during her 15-minute break at work.
SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS	Parents were paid $7.50 per meeting for transportation and babysitting services.
	The project planned for a toy library but lack of space led to each home visitor maintaining a large supply of commercial materials and consumable supplies for exchange or delivery to the parents following each workshop.
EVALUATION	Participation records were kept. At year's end, parents responded to a locally-developed questionnaire about the program.

Horry County, South Carolina

FUNDING	Title III ($43,515)
PROJECT STAFF	Project director (Half-time) 2 Teachers 1 Aide/bus driver Secretary (half-time) 14 High school students (practicum period)
POPULATION SERVED	Any parent in the county with a four-year-old child who agreed to participate as a parent/child team
NUMBER OF PARENTS	50
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	60 four- and five-year-olds
OBJECTIVES	To provide instruction in preschool skills to children and train and motivate the parents to continue this developmental teaching at home
	To train high school students in the role of parenting as part of an elective course in child development
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Parent/child half-day classroom instruction one day each week
	Occasional special purpose parent education night sessions
	High school students working as classroom aide with a specific child and with the group of children
	Toy lending library
PROCEDURES	The project bus brought in parents and children from one section of the county each day, four days each week. Teachers and high school students worked with the children for a two to three hour period. For about half of this period parents observed the instruction,

with explanations, through a one-way mirror; they made instructional items to take home and discussed appropriate child development and management and parenting topics during the other half. Assignments for continued instructional activity at home were made, and materials were checked out of the toy library prior to departure. Home progress was checked the first thing each class day to assure home performance.

Occasional parent training sessions were scheduled at night when special resources were available such as a speech therapist, language consultants, etc.

The staff used Friday for program planning and staff development. Also the staff provided a seminar for the high school students to synthesize their classroom training and textbook reading experiences.

SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS

This project received organization and training assistance as a disseminating effort of the Parent Readiness Education Project in Detroit, Michigan. Project staff went to Detroit and Detroit trainers made two visits to South Carolina. The Detroit Project concept was found to be exportable except that the home instruction activities had to be revised and made more appropriate for the rural environment and household.

EVALUATION

Children were screened with the *Caldwell Preschool Inventory*, the Draw-A-Man Test, and a data analysis sheet produced by PREP. The *Caldwell* was also given as a posttest. Parents' reactions to daily activities were recorded, along with their attendance and participation. High school students also wrote evaluations and responded to "content" questions.

Kershaw County, South Carolina

FUNDING	ESAA/Basic component ($22,000 estimated)
PROJECT STAFF	5 Parent involvement aides
POPULATION SERVED	Parents of children enrolled in first through third grade ESAA classes in five elementary schools and who needed additional help in language skills.
NUMBER OF PARENTS	200; but their involvement ranged from perfunctory to full cooperation and participation
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	200 first through third grade children identified by their ESAA teachers to be low achievers (40 at each of 5 schools).
OBJECTIVES	To provide remedial instruction in language to low achievers as part of the school-based program and to facilitate supplemental remedial instruction at home
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	In-school remedial instruction A lending library in each of four schools: books, toys, pictures, instruction sheets for concept development "Tote bags" for carrying materials home
PROCEDURES	The ESAA teachers in each school identified the 40 lowest achievers. The human potential development specialist diagnosed the remedial needs of each and advised the Parent Involvement Aide what instruction was to be provided. The student reported twice each week for instruction from the aide. Each aide was assigned a work area in the school library and additional space to house the lending library materials. A consultant to the ESAA program from a nearby university provided six inservice sessions to the parent project staff and the human potential development specialists.
SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS	The aides operated a rewards program to assure the return of loaned materials in good condition by maintaining a colorful chart, giving completion certificates for tasks completed at home, and awarding prizes.
EVALUATION	Records were kept of contacts with parents and follow-up activities.

Orangeburg, South Carolina

FUNDING	ESAA/Pilot component ($12,385)
PROJECT STAFF	Parent coordinator
POPULATION SERVED	Parents enrolled in the ESAA classes at four elementary schools, especially those who had younger siblings at home, were not participants in other parent programs, and who elected to attend. Later in the school year all parents of preschool children in two housing projects were invited to participate.
NUMBER OF PARENTS	70-75 participated in at least one parent training session
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	105-110 preschool age children were provided day care services (by college student volunteers) while their parents were involved in training sessions. However, the parent component did not establish direct contact with or provide instructional services to either preschool children or ESAA children.
OBJECTIVES	To train parents in activities and skills which would promote child development To motivate parents toward a permanent school-based parent-teacher organization
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Weekly small-group parent training workshops Individual parent visits to the parent center Volunteer undergraduate students from South Carolina State College
PROCEDURES	Invitation letters were sent home with ESAA students for parents to participate in small group night workshops. Meetings were first scheduled at the Parent Center, to increase attendance; they were then shifted to individual schools, and finally, in the spring, to two housing projects where volunteer parent leaders established a group of participants. Each housing manager authorized use of their public rooms for about two hours one mid-week day each week. The programs were selected sections of multi-media commercial parent programs.
EVALUATION	Attendance records were kept.

Carroll County, Tennessee

FUNDING	Title I ($147,041)
PROJECT STAFF	Project director 5 Home visitors 2 Paraprofessionals 1 Child development specialist 1 Diagnostic prescriptive specialist 1 Secretary
POPULATION SERVED	Rural families with children assessed as high-risk according to a number of criteria
NUMBER OF PARENTS	About 100 families
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	About 130 children, age three to school age
OBJECTIVES	To provide a learning environment to assist preschool high-risk children in four areas of development—personal-social, fine motor-adaptive, language, and gross motor To provide staff development that will be adequate in preparing staff members for providing services in the areas where they are assigned To plan and implement a program of parent and community involvement in the project To implement and refine a plan for dissemination of information about the project both internally and externally To implement and refine a plan for management by objectives for the project
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Each child attends the Early Learning Center one day each week for about four hours (lunch included). A teacher, two aides, and their assigned home visitor work with them. A bus, contracted for with the school system, provides transportation. Mothers ride the bus and, while children are in class, attend a workshop session conducted by the diagnostic/prescriptive specialist. Other parent workshops are held within each of five geographic areas. Locations for these workshops are selected for easy access and availability—a high school, a church, the gas company, an elementary school, and so on. Home visits are made weekly and last about one hour. Activities are planned to meet individual needs of the child as measured and recorded on a detailed developmental profile sheet. A toy or other educational material designed (and often made by the home visitor (to teach a particular skill is left with the parent and child. An activity sheet accompanies the toy, with instructions and space for parent assessment of the activity.
SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS	This project and others in the Early Learning Center (a renovated school building) serve six independent school districts in the county, none of which contribute funds to support the Center. In addition to the six district superintendents, the Center works with the county superintendent. All are members of a Policy Council.

The parents assigned to each home visitor have formed small parent councils. Representatives from each of the five area councils meet regularly as the project's parent council. This helps to solve some of the problems presented by a scattered geographic distribution of families.

The bus serving the children is a contract item, paid on a mileage basis. To help the transportation system function smoothly at reasonable cost, the home visitor sometimes delivers the most remote children in their areas to a central pick-up point.

The Cannon Early Learning Center, a renovated school building, houses several special projects and offers adequate space for each, in addition to a gymnasium and a kitchen. Project staff were responsible for renovating and repairing the building and did so at remarkably little cost.

A detailed developmental profile sheet was developed for diagnosis and a record of progress. Both the mother and the home visitor have a copy of the profile, and each keeps a record of skills learned by the child. Keyed to the development skills are activity sheets prepared by the staff and related games, toys, and other learning materials.

EVALUATION

Before and after program involvement, children were administered the *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test*, the *Beery-Buktenica Developmental Test of Visual-Motor Integration* and the *Slossen Intelligence Test*. Other tests, questionnaires, and assessment forms include a parental attitude questionnaire, a home stimulation scale, a staff performance evaluation checklist, an employee goal-setting evaluation form, a workshop evaluation form, a checklist for modes of instruction, and a developmental tasks evaluation checklist. Detailed records are kept by home visitors and staff conducting parent workshop.

Chattanooga, Tennessee

FUNDING	Title III ($75,000)
PROJECT STAFF	Project director Writer/development specialist Planning and evaluation specialist
POPULATION SERVED	Materials being developed are intended for use across federal programs, mainly Head Start, Title I, and Follow Through
NUMBER OF PARENTS	20 parents are involved as reactors for assessing the materials being developed;1,000 are expected to field test the materials in 1976-77
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	Children of the 20 reactor parents
OBJECTIVES	To produce and/or refine for publication and dissemination four coordinated set of materials for use by parents, children, and teachers To demonstrate two options for delivery of outreach parent training in the development of preschool competencies (This objective is for the second year of the development cycle.)
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Since this program was funded for product development, its strategies follow the basic product development cycle: review of the field, specifying characteristics of the product to be developed, actual production, small-scale try out, refinement, large-scale field testing and finally dissemination. Efforts in this first year were wisely limited to producing and trying out on a small scale. Materials were produced for four purposes: to provide a profile of a child's preschool competencies, to provide activities for parents to help build those competencies, to provide for parents manuals and guides to help them with their role as teachers, and to provide school staff with guidelines for parent involvement. Specific materials include: 1. a preschool competency profile checklist to be available for each child and his/her parents 2. a set of parent/child activity cards relating to general skills, prereading skills, and premathematics skills. 200 activity cards and 32 games were produced this year. 3. a set of parent booklets, one a series in itself containing five units or separate booklets on ways to learn. Others are individual booklets about teaching behaviors, parenting behaviors, health habits, and social development. 4. a guide for teachers and parent coordinators to help them involve parents in their children's education and to implement the newly-developed curriculum and activity card system for parents. All materials were tried out with a small number of parents and children as they were being developed. Provisions were made for parents' written assessment of activity cards and booklets. After refinement and revision, all materials will be field tested in Head Start and Title I programs.
SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS	The support of the entire school administration for projects of this kind is total. Adding to the strength and capabilities of individual product development specialists are the variety of programs needing such materials and available for field testing, the evaluation

capabilities within the system, and the availability of parent volunteers for work that would otherwise be costly and more time-consuming.

EVALUATION Since this was a product development project, process evaluation occurred throughout the year. Materials were field tested with a large number of parents, who responded to questions about the clarity, ease of use, and value of the materials.

Claiborne County, Tennessee
Clinch-Powell Educational Cooperative

FUNDING	Title III ($84,425)
PROJECT STAFF	Project director 1 Teacher/driver 4 Home visitors 1 Communications specialists 1 Secretary
POPULATION SERVED	Volunteer families living in a four-county area
NUMBER OF PARENTS	Parents in 105 families
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	About 110 three- and four-year-olds
OBJECTIVES	To provide preschool educational experiences for about 110 children, ages 3 and 4 and to assess the program through comparison of scores of children participating with those of children not participating on tests of cognitive and social development. To involve parents directly in the education of their children in order to help them become more effective teachers and to develop positive attitudes toward themselves and their roles in their children's development To develop knowledge and skills in early childhood education in four paraprofessionals and one teacher; to provide specialized training for paraprofessionals leading toward a certificate To disseminate the project's outcomes and products to interested professionals outside of the four-county area

STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	A mobile classroom stops at eight locations around the four-county area, two each day. Parent workshops are held on varying schedules from weekly to monthly at community centers. Home visits are made to each family once a week for about 30 to 45 minutes. Toy and materials libraries are set up in each center.
PROCEDURES	Two mobile vans serve a four-county area; one is supported by this project. The van stops at eight locations a week, serving from 12 to 15 children at each for one-half day. Two or three mothers are present during each session as volunteer assistants. The teacher/driver has available in the van an extensive array of equipment and educational materials. Parents have established their own schedules for regular meetings at four community centers, one in each county. About ten parents attend each meeting. Typical activities include making materials for use at home, checking out toys and books, and discussing topics of concern. Weekly one-hour home visits are made to each family. The home visitor talks with the parent(s) about parenting techniques and demonstrates some ways to work with the child. She also leaves with the parent a weekly guide to the Captain Kangaroo show and discusses activities related to the shows. An extensive toy and book library is located in each of the four community centers. Parent check out materials at meetings or receive them from home visitors.
SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS	This is a four-county cooperative serving a completely rural area. Several projects for young children and families cooperatively share resources and staff. Great importance is put on staff development, and all staff meet on Friday for training sessions and are enrolled in a credit course offered by a local college but held at the Cooperative.
EVALUATION	Children were pre- and posttested with the *Vineland Social Maturity Scale*, the *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test*, and the *Caldwell Preschool Inventory*. Records were kept of parent participation at workshops and during home visits and of children's attendance at the mobile van classroom.

Greene County, Tennessee

FUNDING	Title III ($53,520)
PROJECT STAFF	Project director/teacher 4 Home visitors 1 Bus driver (parttime) 1 Nurse/health coordinator (not supported from Title III funds)
POPULATION SERVED	Low-income, educationally disadvantaged families in Greenville and surrounding rural areas
NUMBER OF PARENTS	About 102 parents in 63 families
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	About 63 three- and four-year-olds
OBJECTIVES	To provide educational experiences to stimulate development of language, psychomotor, and social skills of children
	To promote positive parent/child interactions by involving parents more directly in children's education and by strengthening parents' capacity for facilitating children's total development
	To coordinate and utilize community resources to meet the assessed needs of children and families
	To identify and correct existing health problems of children and to insure future health through preventive measures
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Classroom sessions for children one day a week for about 3 hours (includes lunch)
	Weekly home visits to each family
	Monthly parent meetings, combining project business and workshop activities
	Toys and materials distributed by home visitors
PROCEDURES	Children attend the preschool center, housed in a former school (now used for a variety of educational programs), one day each week. A bus is shared with another program and makes a second daily round for Title III participants. The project director teaches each group, assisted by the home visitor assigned to that group. Parents are invited to ride the bus with their children and to visit the classroom. About six do this each week.
	One-hour home visits are made weekly to each home, sometime more often if needed. The home visitor talks with mothers about child development and care, leaves a toy or book from the library, and provides continuity between classroom and home. Guides for the Captain Kangaroo series are received regularly.
	Most families are from outlying rural areas, and home visitors are assigned to the area in which they live.
	Once a month the parents meet at the center to participate in planning activities and in workshop activities. Transportation is provided for those who need it. Average attendance is about 20.
	A small toy and material lending library is housed at the center. Distribution occurs mainly via the home visitor.
	Health care and nutrition is important to project staff and is the topic of parent meetings. A health coordinator, shared with the

Head Start project, conducts screening tests and spends much time seeing that children and families receive the care and services which they need. Often such services are donated by physicians and dentists in the community.

SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS

Cooperative sharing of resources is important to the success of this project. Since Head Start is housed in the same buildings, many materials and equipment are shared. Teachers and the health coordinator are involved in both projects. The school psychologist assists as needed, especially in evaluation procedures and testing.

It seems to be typical of many of the rural families that social activities are not important to them as motivation for attending meetings. Because of this and because the "business" nature of the first meetings turned some parents off, the format of parent meetings was changed in midyear and incentives were offered for participation. The focus of meetings became the children; incentives were child-related. Attendance increased sharply as did interest and general support of the project.

The home visitor, on her first visit to each home, presented the child with a gaily-colored "Treasure Box" of consumable but useful items (about a $2 value). This was important to the child because it was attractive and had his or her name on it.

EVALUATION

Children responded to a *Developmental Evaluation* (Home Start) at the beginning of the program and to the *Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks*. Parents completed an inventory of parent behavior adapted from the DARCEE programs.

Memphis, Tennessee

FUNDING	Title I ($330,000)
PROJECT STAFF	Project director Assistant director 8 Teachers 32 Home visitors 1 Secretary
POPULATION SERVED	Low-income families with children who may be educationally disadvantaged, living near the eight schools in which the preschool centers are housed. Participation was voluntary and depended on the parents' agreeing to attend the Center at least twice a month and to allow home visitors to work with their children in their homes.
NUMBER OF PARENTS	480 families
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	About 480 to 520 three- and four-year-olds
OBJECTIVES	To provide structured learning opportunities for preschoolers to teach them needed skills as measured by Project MEMPHIS (a diagnostic instrument) To teach parents to construct and use toys and games to instruct their children at home; to provide instruction in parenting skills
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	8 preschool centers established in elementary schools in 4 decentralized areas of the school system. Children visited centers once a week for 3½ hours. Home visits once a week to each family for about 45 minutes Required visits by parents by parents twice monthly to the centers Regular parent meetings, usually held in the morning
PROCEDURES	Home visitors from the centers surveyed the neighborhoods and recruited 15 to 18 families each. Those families not enrolled in the program were put on waiting lists. Each center, with one lead teacher and four home visitors, served about 60-65 children. Children were bused to their respective centers one day each week for about three hours. Twice a month a parent or other caregiver was required to accompany each child. Each child's program was individualized as much as possible, with center and home activities focusing on those skills which a diagnostic test indicated were needed. Each center interruped class sessions for children every fourth week to allow the teachers a chance to make about 20 home visits. Home visits, lasting about 45 minutes, were made weekly. A home visitor's typical schedule was to plan three days of visiting, one day with her children in the center, and Friday for staff development. The home visitors took instructional activities and materials into the home, along with a prescribed lesson plan. She instructed the child and observed the mother working with the child. Parent workshops or meetings were held at each center during the day so that parents had a chance to share experiences, view films, listen to speakers, and make games to take home.

SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS	The individualized approach to lesson plans and learning activities for each child allowed the teacher, home visitors, and parents to focus on those skills needed by the child. Transportation was provided by contract with the regular school bus service for each center. The home visitor rode the bus as it picked up and delivered children and their mothers. Elementary schools wishing to participate were required to provide two rooms, one for parent use and one for children's classes.
EVALUATION	A random sample of children were pre- and posttested with the *Tests of Basic Experiences* and the *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test*. At the end of the year children also were tested with the *Caldwell Cooperative Preschool Inventory*. Selected parents responded to an attitude survey and a survey on their activities with children at home. Home visitors and teachers also responded to attitudinal surveys and questions relating to project objectives.

Murfreesboro, Tennessee

FUNDING	Local ($20,000 parent component)
PROJECT STAFF	Project director (paid from other sources) 2 Teachers 2 Paraprofessionals 1 Home visitor 1 Secretary
POPULATION SERVED	The low-income, educationally disadvantaged families of six communities in the city
NUMBER OF PARENTS	75-80 families
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	About 85-90 three- and four-year-olds
OBJECTIVES	To increase parents' knowledge of child development and to make them more aware of the importance of the early years in subsequent development To provide materials and techniques to help parents (and siblings) carry out purposeful learning activities with children at home
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Two mobile vans, Classrooms on Wheels, provide classrooms for 12 to 15 children per group Parent workshops, or Child Care Seminars, held twice monthly Home visits made to parents not attending Child Care Seminars and to those who couldn't be reached in other ways A tote bag system for children's carrying home activities for parents to do with them (picture, book, toy) Regular mailings of activity sheets and newsletters

PROCEDURES

The classroom on wheels (two mobile vans) met six groups of three- and four-year-olds two days each week for a two-hour period. Classroom sessions were held at three locations (nurseries, public park, church yard). Over the eight years of the project's existence a well-balanced curriculum for children was developed, using some commercial materials and many locally-produced materials.

Parent groups met twice monthly in a central location. Evening sessions were presented again the following morning.

The entire staff was involved in the Child Care Seminars, each attended by about 46 parents.

Home visits were made regularly to parents unable to attend Child Care Seminars and to other families in special circumstances.

An extensive library of toys, books, and pictures has been established over the years. Almost all items were made by project staff. Such items reached parents generally through the tote bag system. Children leaving the classroom on wheels carried home with them a sturdy tote bag containing a book, a toy, and a laminated picture with directions for the parents on the back.

SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS

This eight-year-old program began as a Title III project and has existed for five years on local funds and contributions. The community has donated to the project in innumberable ways- articles of clothing for children, gifts to be used as prizes for parents at meetings, supplies, enrichment activities, refreshments, learning materials, parking space for mobile classrooms and so on.

A Volunteer Reader's Club was organized for siblings who read assigned books to their younger brothers and sisters at home.

A newsletter and language activity sheet were mailed weekly to each family. The activity sheets were coordinated with the children's experiences in the mobile classroom and thus parents reinforced learning at home.

Over time an extensive curriculum for parents was developed through a series of booklets on child development, management, techniques of teaching, and language and concept development.

The program continues to operate through the summer with support from a local church.

EVALUATION

The *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test* was administered to children at beginning and end of year. Selected parents responded to a locally-developed parent inventory at year's end.

Nashville, Tennessee

FUNDING	Title I ($110,000)
PROJECT STAFF	Project director 4 Teachers 4 Paraprofessionals Part time secretary
POPULATION SERVED	Participating families were recruited from among those living in four low-income housing projects
NUMBER OF PARENTS	176 have participated throughout the year, with many replacements as some left the program.
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	About 200 two-, three-, and four-year-olds
OBJECTIVES	To develop in children the skills and attitudes which have been shown to be necessary for school achievement and later competence in society To develop in the parents of the children the skills and attitudes known to be necessary for fostering development and sustaining proficiency in children
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Two-year-olds: Home visits weekly for one hour Three- and four-year-olds: Home visits weekly for one hour at beginning of year. After buses were renovated, classes in four mobile classrooms twice weekly for two hours Four parent workshops, one each quarter Toy and material lending library located at Title I schools and on mobile vans
PROCEDURES	Full operation took place toward the end of the project year because of difficulties in renovating four buses for mobile classrooms. Until this time, concentration was on home visits, weekly for one hour to all children. When three- and four-year-olds began to attend classes in the mobile vans, home visits continued for two-year-olds. During home visits parents observed the home visitor working with the child and discussed with the home visitor ideas about parenting, child development, and so on. The home visitor also delivered materials from the lending library. Parent workshops were held each quarter for each group of parents. These were evening sessions lasting about two hours. Parents listened to someone speaking and then discussed the topic and their concerns and problems.
SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS	Teachers and paraprofessionals were regular members of Title I school faculty and assigned to this project by the principals. In each school is a school/community facilitator who informs the community about school programs. Much emphasis was placed on a structured staff development program, using consultants as well as local specialists.

EVALUATION	As a pre and post measure, two-year-olds were administered the *Learning Accomplishment Profile*, while a sample of three- and four-year-olds took the *Stanford-Binet*. All children responded to items on the *Alpern Development Profile* and a locally-developed *Child Progress Checklist* during the year. Information from mothers was gathered with the *Maternal Teaching Style Instrument* and a *Family Data Inventory*. At the end of the year mothers also gave their reaction to the program.

Oak Ridge, Tennessee

FUNDING	Title I, Head Start ($1,500 for parent component)
PROJECT STAFF	Project director 5 Teachers 10 Aides 1 Secretary 1 Speech therapist
POPULATION SERVED	All parents of children enrolled at the preschool center. Most are from the low income, low educational level families of urban Oak Ridge.
NUMBER OF PARENTS	157 parents, including a high percentage of fathers, of preschoolers enrolled in Head Start, handicapped, and Title I programs
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	150 three- and four-year-olds qualifying for Head Start, Title I, or a handicapped program. About one-half of the children have been diagnosed as handicapped in some way.
OBJECTIVES	To provide opportunities for parent involvement for the parents of children in Head Start and Title I programs
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Five preschool classrooms are housed in a former school building providing adequate space for group learning and for movement education. Parents visit the project classrooms frequently to observe, to teach, and to discuss their children's progress. Teachers visit each home twice a year for about one hour to discuss progress and possible health, nutrition, or family problems with which the project could help. The teacher also observes the home situation and talks about parenting techniques.

Parent workshops or group sessions are held about three times yearly for all parents. Some attend special sessions conducted through an adult education grant from the Department of Education.

PROCEDURES

Children come daily to the classes operated by Title I and Head Start. Buses provide transportation. All children and families receive maximum health and social services through the project. All children are tested or cared for by a speech therapist, a guidance counselor, and a school psychologist.

Home visits are made to the participating families twice a year by the teachers. In addition two conferences are scheduled for each set of parents, fall and spring.

About 10% of the parents participate as volunteers in the classrooms. About three special programs and sessions are held annually for all parents.

Thirty parents signed up for a series of weekly parent training classes offered through an adult basic education grant from the Tennessee Department of Education. Items of discussion include child development, parenting skills, and materials which parents can use at home in educational activities.

SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS

A sophisticated system for diagnosing each child's special needs allows the staff to identify early in the year any handicaps or disabilities which may need project and parent attention. The Diagnostic Center benefits from the services of a speech therapist, a guidance counselor, and a school psychologist, all of whom work very closely with staff and parents.

A high percentage of participation by fathers is achieved by requiring that both parents of handicapped children be involved, by offering workshops of special interest to fathers, and by making concerted efforts to reach out to fathers as well as mothers.

A tremendous coordination of funding sources and community resources has resulted in the project's coming nearer each year to its goal of total family service. Health and social problems are not only identified and diagnosed but treated as well through community contributions of time and services. The preschool program has coordinated projects funded from several sources into an integrated program for children and their families.

EVALUATION

Tests used for children in the program were: *Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities*, the *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test*, a *Test for Auditory Comprehension of Language*, *McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities*, *Boston Speech and Sound Discrimination Test*, *Templin Darley Tests of Articulation*, and the *Basic Test of Learning Skills*. A locally-developed *Prekindergarten Checklist* was also used.

Indications of parent progress were mainly attendance records and participation in program activities.

Tipton County, Tennessee

FUNDING	Title I ($54,000)
PROJECT STAFF	1 Teacher 4 Home visitors 1 Aide (busdriver)
POPULATION SERVED	Participation is voluntary from four areas of the county.
NUMBER OF PARENTS	63 mothers
NUMBER AND AGE OF CHILDREN	63 three- and four-year-olds
OBJECTIVES	To provide educational experiences to stimulate the development of language, psychomotor, and social skills of children To promote positive parent/child interactions by involving parents more directly in the education of their children To strengthen parents' capacity for facilitating the total development of their children To provide preventive and corrective health services
STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY	Weekly one-hour visits to each home Mobile van classes for children once a week in each of four areas of the county Three parent meetings during the year
PROCEDURES	A mobile classroom stopped at four locations in the county and served 12 to 15 children at each. Another smaller van transported children to the mobile classroom and home again. Four home visitors recruited the families and visited them once a week. Each home visitor assisted the teacher during the time that her assigned children were in the mobile classroom. One parent volunteer also worked with the teacher and home visitor each session. During home visits the aides talked with mothers about reading to their children (aides read a book during visit), watching the Captain Kangaroo show and doing activities suggested by the *Guide* which was distributed to mothers regularly. Home visitors also delivered items which they made for parents during Friday staff days Three parent training sessions were held during the year. Transportation for mothers was provided by the van and by home visitors. About 30 parents participated at each meeting.
SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS	At each location the mobile classroom served two shifts of children. Each was picked up by a project-owned van and brought to the mobile classroom. The shifts overlapped at lunch time. Each child experienced the reading of three books each week: one read by the teacher in the mobile van, one by the home visitor, and one by the parent.
EVALUATION	Information on parents was gathered with the *Educational Needs Assessment: Inventory of Parent Behavior* and a parent questionnaire about the program. A checklist of skills was kept for each child.

Appendix A Participating Local Educational Agencies

District	Superintendent	Contact Person	Project Director
Alabama			
Birmingham Board of Education	Dr. Wilmer S. Cody 2015 7th Ave. P. O. Box 10007 Birmingham, AL 35202 (205) 323-8521	Paul Houston 2015 7th Ave. P. O. Box 10007 Birmingham, AL (205) 252-1800	June Mays 2015 7 Avenue North P. O. Box 10007 Birmingham, AL 35202 (205) 252-1800
Greene County Board of Education	Robert Brown P.O. Box 569 Eutaw, AL 34562 (205) 372-3161	Earnest Palmer P.O. Box 569 Eutaw, AL 35462. (205) 372-3161	Eunice Outland P.O. Box 569 Eutaw, AL 35462 (205) 372-3578
Huntsville City Schools	Mr. V.M. Burkett P.O. Box 1256 Huntsville, AL 35807 (205) 539-2111	Floyd McLeod P.O. Box 1256 Huntsville, AL 35807 (205) 539-2111	Saranel Detamore Bradley Building 3405 Triana Blvd. Huntsville, AL 35807 (205) 539-2111
Mobile County Public Schools	Dr. Harold Collins P.O. Box 1327 Mobile, AL 36601 (205) 438-6011	Richard LoDestro 504 Government St. Mobile, AL 36602 (205) 438-6011	Lemuel Taylor 504 Government St. Mobile, AL 36602 (205) 438-6011
Montgomery Public Schools	Mr. W.S. Garrett P.O. Box 1991 Montgomery, AL 36103 (205) 269-9111	Thomas Bobo P.O. Box 1991 Montgomery, AL 36103 (205) 269-9111	Maggie L. Walker P.O. Box 1991 Montgomery, AL 36103 (205) 269-9111 Frances Cooley P.O. Box 1991 Montgomery, AL 36103 (205) 269-9111
Florida			
Alachua County Board of Education	Dr. James W. Longstreth 1817 East University Ave. Gainesville, FL 32601 (904) 373-5192	Mary Koru 1817 E. University Ave. Gainesville, FL 32601 (904) 373-5192	Mary Virginia Fearnside Woodland Park 1900 S.E. 4th Street Gainesville, FL 32601 (904) 373-0883

District	Superintendent	Contact Person	Project Director
Broward County School Board	William Drainer 1320 SW Fourth St. Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312 (305) 765-6474	Dr. Terrance Weed 1001 N.W. Fourth St. Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33312 (305) 765-6474	Marie Chittum Dept. of Early Childhood Ed. School Board of Broward County 1320 SW Fourth St. Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312 (305) 765-6362
Georgia			
Clarke County School District	Dr. Charles McDaniel P.O. Box 1708 Athens, GA 30601 (404) 546-7721	Joseph Taylor 500 College Ave. Athens, GA 30601 (404) 546-7721	Ms. Martha deBeaugrine P.O. Box 1708 Athens, GA 30601
Dooly County Board of Education	W.F. Stone Courthouse Annex Vienna, GA 31092 (912) 268-4761	Benny Wade Courthouse Annex Vienna, GA 31902 (912) 268-4815	Gayle Johnson Courthouse Annex Vienna, GA 31902 (912) 268-4815
Muscogee County School District	Braxton Nail 1200 Bradley Drive Columbus, GA 31906 (404) 324-5661	Jo Ann Stallings Claflin Center 1532 Fifth Ave. Columbus, GA 31901 (404) 324-6483	Mrs. Sharon Watson 4312 Harrison Ave. Columbus, GA 31904 (404) 322-4161
Richmond County Board of Education	W. G. Oellerich 2083 Heckle St. Augusta, GA 30904	Dave Mack 2083 Heckle St. Augusta, GA 30904 (404) 736-8452	Dorothy E. Dicks T.W. Josey High School 1701 Fifteenth St. Augusta, GA 30901 (404) 738-1576
Kentucky			
Owensboro Public Schools	James C. Hillard 1335 W. 11th St. P.O. Box 746 Owensboro, KY 42301 (502) 685-2981	Duane Miller 1335 W. 11th St. P.O. Box 746 Owensboro, KY 42301 (502) 685-2981	Pam Kirland Longfellow Educational Ctr. 1716 Frederica St. Owensboro, KY 42301 (502) 685-4536

Mississippi

Columbia Municipal School District	C. Hines Cronin 613 Bryant Ave. Columbia, MS 39429 (601) 736-2366	Robert Ferguson 613 Bryant Ave. Columbia, MS 39429 (601) 736-7371	Ann McDaniel Columbia Primary School 501 Dale Street Columbia, MS 39429
Jackson Municipal Separate School District	Robert Fortenberry 662 South President St. Jackson, MS 39205 (601) 352-3512	Dr. Swinton Hill P.O. Box 2338 Jackson, MS 39205 (601) 948-4795	Mrs. Limmie Flowers Dawson Elementary School 4215 Sunset Dr. Jackson, MS 39205 (601) 362-9197 Ms. Velma Taylor 4215 Sunset Drive Jackson, MS 39205 (601) 362-9197

North Carolina

Edenton-Chowan Schools	Dr. John B. Dunn P.O. Box 206 Edenton, NC 27932 (919) 482-4438	Wilbur G. Pierce P.O. Box 206 Edenton, NC 27932 (919) 482-4438	Barbara Ward P.O. Box 206 Edenton, NC 27932 (919) 482-4438

South Carolina

Charleston County School District	A.C. Crews P.O. Box 2218 Charleston, SC 29401 (803) 722-8841	Dr. R.A. McWhirt 3 Chisholm St. Charleston, SC 29401 (803) 722-8461	Pat Bower P.O. Box 2218 Charleston, SC 29401 (803) 722-8461
Horry County School District	Donald Johnson Drawer 680 Conway, SC 29526 (803) 248-2206	Joel West Drawer 680 Conway, SC 29526 (803) 248-2206	Carol Pascua Drawer 680 Conway, SC 29526 (803) 248-2206
Kershaw County School District	J.C. Walton Educational Bldg. Dubose Court Camden, SC 29020 (803) 432-8416	Francis Snellgrove Educational Bldg. Dubose Court Camden, SC 29020 (803) 432-8416	Jerry F. Toms Educational Bldg. Dubose Court Camden, SC 29020 (803) 432-8416

District	Superintendet	Contact Person	Project Director
Orangeburg County School Dist. #5	W.J. Clark 587 Ellis Ave. Orangeburg, SC 29115 (803) 534-5454	Irene Myers 587 Ellis Avenue Orangeburg, SC 29115 (803) 534-5454	Betty Stone 587 Ellis Ave. Orangeburg, SC 29115 (803) 534-5454
Richland County School District	Mr. Bill M. Holcombe 1616 Richland St. Columbia, SC 29201 (803)765-2491	Ann Sprott 1616 Richland St. Columbia, SC 29201 (803) 765-2491	Judy Watson 1616 Richland St. Columbia, SC 29201 (803) 765-2491
Tennessee			
Carroll County	Larry D. Vick 113 West P.O. Box 510 Huntingdon, TN 38344 (901) 986-5134		Lon Z. Shuler Cannon Early Learning Ctr. Route 2, Box 54 Huntingdon, TN 38344 (901) 986-4482
Chattanooga Public Schools	James Henry 1161 W. Fortieth St. Chattanooga, TN 37409 (615) 821-2513	Jack Conner 1161 W. Fortieth St. Chattanooga, TN 37409 (615) 821-2513	Dr. Frank Sanders 1161 W. Fortieth St. Chattanooga, TN 37409 (615) 821-2513
Claiborne County Schools	James C. Neely Claiborne County Schools Tazewell, TN 37879 (615) 869-3605	William Locke Clinch-Powell Educational Coop. P.O. Box 97 Tazewell, TN 37879 (615) 869-3605	Ann Hampton Clinch-Powell Educational Coop. P.O. Box 97 Tazewell, TN 37879 (615) 869-3605
Greene County School Board	Howard McNeese Union and Charles Greeneville, TN 37743	John Hankins Union & Charles Greeneville, TN 37743 (615) 638-4194	Tana Slater George Clem Admin. Ctr. Box 30 Greeneville, TN 37743 (615) 639-3031
Memphis City Schools	John P. Freeman 2597 Avery Ave. Memphis, TN 38812 (901) 454-5444	Colonel Maurice Roach 2597 Avery Ave. Memphis, TN 38812 (901) 454-5406	Chestine Cown 2597 Avery Ave. Memphis, TN 38812 (901) 454-5386

Murfreesboro City Schools	Dr. Dana Swick Murfreesboro City Schools 109 North Spring St. Murfreesboro, TN 37130		Mrs. Ruth Bowdoin Murfreesboro City Schools 109 North Spring St. Murfreesboro, TN 37130 (615)893-6820
Nashville Metropolitan Schools	Dr. Elbert Brooks 2601 Bransford Ave. Nashville, TN 37204 (615) 259-5251		Carolyn S. Brown Metropolitan Public Schools 2601 Bransford Ave. Nashville, TN 37204 (615) 259-5148
Oak Ridge Schools	Dr. Kenneth H. Loflin Oak Ridge Schools P.O. Box Q Oak Ridge, TN 37831 (615) 482-2133		Mrs. Doris Webber Oak Ridge Schools Center for Inservice Education East Tennessee Ave. Oak Ridge, TN 37830 (615) 483-9417
Tipton County Schools	Shannon Faulkner P.O. Box 486 Covington, TN 38019 (901) 467-7148	Dr. Harry Day P.O. Box 486 Covington, TN 38019 (901) 467-7148	Susan Turner P.O. Box 486 Covington, TN 38019

Appendix B

Advisory Committee Members

Dr. Earl Schaefer
Professor of Maternal and Child Health
Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27517
(919) 966-2019

Ms. Dianne Willis
Exploring Childhood
Southeast Field Coordinator
Office of Child Development
50 Seventh Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30323
(404) 526-3936

Mr. John L. Jordan
Director
Office of Child Development
50 Seventh Street, N.E.
Room 339
Atlanta, Georgia 30323
(404) 526-3936

Mr. James L. Shelton
Parent Involvement Specialist
Office of Child Development
50 Seventh Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30323
(404) 526-3936

Mrs. Gloria Gross
1196 Converse Drive, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30324
(404) 237-4361

Mrs. Rayma C. Page
Lee County School Board
2412 Kent Avenue
Ft. Myers, Florida 33901
(813) 936-1524

Dr. Milly Cowles
School of Education
University of Alabama
Birmingham, Alabama 35294

Mr. Jule M. Sugarman
Chief Administrative Officer
Office of the Mayor
207 City Hall
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
(404) 658-6000

Mrs. Ada P. Puryear
Administrator,
Early Childhood and Elementary Education
Knott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
(904) 488-6769

Dr. Brandon Sparkman
Assistant Superintendent
Hartsell City Schools
Hartsell, Alabama 35640
(215) 773-5419

Dr. Ronald Luckie
Director
Planning, Research and Evaluation
State Office Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
(404) 656-2402

Dr. Ira Gordon
2900 Southwest Second Court
Gainesville Florida 32601
(904) 392-0741

Dr. Paul G. Orr
College of Education
University of Alabama
P.O. Box Q
University, Alabama 35486
(205) 348-6050

Dr. Andrew A. Robinson
Dept. of Administration and Operations
University of North Florida
St. Johns Bluff Road South
P.O. Box 17074
Jacksonville, Florida 32216
(904) 646-2666

State Department Liaisons

Mr. J. W. Jenkins
Division of K-ECE
Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Ms. Mildred Williams
P. O. Box 17092
Jackson State University
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

Mrs. Louise Higgins
State Department of Education
Division of Instruction
501 Dexter Avenue
Montgomery, Alabama 36130

Dr. Priscilla D. Kesting
State Department of Education
The Capitol
Room 115
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Dr. Allen Gurley
State Department of Education
242 State Office Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Mr. Taylor Hollin
State Department of Education
Capitol Plaza Tower
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Mr. Joel Taylor
State Department of Education
313 Rutledge Building
Room 803
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Ms. Melinda Taylor
State Department of Education
Cordell Hull Building
Room 112
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Appendix C

Parent Education Demonstration Project Evaluators

Dr. Jerold P. Bauch
Professor of Early Childhood Education
Box 81
George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, TN 37203

Dr. Mary Tom Berry
Professor of Education
Box 296
Middle Tennessee State University
Murfreesboro, TN 37130

Ms. Johann Chancey
State Consultant, ECE & Elem. Ed.
221-D Center Bldg.
Dept. of Education
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Mr. George D. Clark, Jr.
Director-Elem. Education Memphis
City Schools
2597 Avery Avenue
Memphis, TN 38112

Dr. Billie Holladay
Director of Elem. Instruction
Charleston County Schools
3 Chisolm Street
Charleston, SC 29401

Dr. J. Butler James
Associate Executive Secretary
Commission On Elem. Schools
SACS
795 Peachtree Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Dr. Catherine B. Janes
Head, Curriculum & Instruction Dept.
P.O. Drawer 2158
Lafayette, LA 70501

Mr. Otis A. Mason
Supervisor, Elementary Schools
P. O. Box 500
St. Augustine, FL 32084

Dr. Arthur L. Miller
Professor
University of Alabama
Box 1382
University, AL 35486

Dr. Linda T. Murray
Coordinator of Research
Broward County Schools
1001 N.W. Fourth Street
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311

Ms. LeRosa H. Smith
Principal
Turie T. Small Elementary School
800 South Street
Daytona Beach, FL 32014

Mr. Joel Taylor
Chief Supervisor—School Services
S.C. State Department of Education
Columbia, SC

Mrs. Joyce B. Weddington
Assistant Director—Research
Memphis City Schools
2597 Avery Avenue
Memphis, TN 38016

Mr. Volover Williams
628 S. 16 Street
Baton Rouge, LA 70802